

THE
MERCERSBURG QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1857.

ART. I.—THE EVANGELICAL CHURCH DIET OF GERMANY.

THE German Evangelical Church Diet has now been in existence since 1848, and become one of the most important and encouraging facts in the history of modern Protestantism. A condensed account of its origin, history, influence and prospects, based upon the official reports of its proceedings, as they were published from year to year, upon personal observations made at its seventh meeting at Frankfort on the Maine, and upon intercourse and correspondence with its founders and leading members, must be both interesting and instructive to those who wish to become fully acquainted with the present state of theology and religion in the land of the Reformation.

The Kirchentag, or Church Diet, is a free association of pious professors, ministers and laymen of Protestant Germany, for the discussion of the religious and ecclesiastical questions of the day, and for the promotion of the interests of practical Christianity, embraced under the term *Inner Mission*. It meets annually in one of the leading cities of Germany, and is at present by far the largest and most respectable representation of evangelical Christianity in that country. Its doctrinal basis is the Bible, as explained by the ecumenical symbols and the evangelical confessions of the sixteenth century. It comprehends thus far four protestant denominations, the Lutheran, German Reformed, United Evangelical (a union of the former two), and the Moravian brotherhood, and holds intercourse at the same

time, with foreign evangelical Churches of Switzerland, France, Holland, England, Scotland and the United States, as far as they may choose to have themselves represented at its meetings, by official delegates on the above general Christian and positive protestant basis. The Church Diet is no formal or official union of these denominations, but a free confederation simply of many hundreds and thousands of their ministerial and lay members, although it looks undoubtedly to a stronger consolidation and coöperation of the original Churches of the Reformation against their common enemies from without and from within. All parts of Germany, especially Prussia and Würtemberg, the two leading evangelical States, send delegates to this body, and amongst them their very best men. But the rationalists and semi-rationalists, as well as those rigid Lutherans who refuse to hold any ecclesiastical communion with the Reformed and the Unionists, oppose it,—the former, because it is too orthodox and churchly for them; the latter, because it is not confessional and churchly enough, in their sectarian and exclusive sense of the term.

This assembly may be regarded as the practical fruit of that vigorous evangelical theology which, for the last twenty or thirty years, has risen in successful opposition against the most learned and dangerous forms of infidelity. The leaders of that theology, as Tholuck, Nitzsch, Müller, Hengstenberg, Dorner, Ullmann, Hoffmann, Ebrard, Lange, etc., are also amongst the principal founders and supporters of the Kirchentag. But the war, victoriously waged in the field of science and literature, must now be carried into the congregations and the practical life of the people. This work must be continued and completed by the rising generation of ministers trained by orthodox and pious professors, by the various Church-governments, and by free associations, of which the one under consideration is by far the largest and most influential.

The German Church Diet took its rise in the eventful year 1848, when all the thrones of Europe—save those of England, Belgium and Russia—trembled, and the very

foundations of civil and religious society seemed to give way, to make room, as was to be feared, to a reign of rationalism, atheism and Satanism. It appeared after the storms and earthquakes of revolution, as a rain-bow of peace and promise, on the horizon of Germany, and has outlived the commotions and mush-room creations, the bright hopes and dark fears of the memorable year of its birth.

It is true it was prepared long before by the pastoral conferences, which, since the days of a revival of religious life, assembled annually pious ministers and laymen in various parts of Germany; and also by the desire of many of the most distinguished divines, for a closer union and independent action of the national churches, held under the bondage of as many secular governments. But the imminent danger of an approaching dissolution of all order in that revolutionary year on the one side, and the labors of the Parliament of Frankfort for a political regeneration of Germany on the basis of unity and constitutional liberty, on the other, matured this desire and suggested the plan of a great meeting of all the true friends of Christianity, for mutual consultation on the present crisis of the country, and for forming a confederation of the Protestant Churches without destroying their distinctive features or interfering with their internal affairs; in fine, a sort of evangelical defensive and offensive alliance against the growing flood of infidelity and destruction.

These ideas sprang up simultaneously, as with the instinct of historical necessity, in different minds, amongst which Dr. von Bethmann Hollweg, of Berlin, Dr. Dörner, then at Bonn, Dr. Ullman and Hundeshagen, of Heidelberg, Dr. Wackernagel, then at Wiesbaden, Bonnet, Heller and Haupt, in or near Frankfort, were the most active; and in several local pastoral conferences, especially one held at Bonn, on the 11th of May, 1848, one at Berlin, on the 21st of June, and two at the Sandhof, near Frankfort-on-the-Maine, on the 3rd of May and 21st of June, of the same year.

At the last mentioned meeting many perplexities arose, and doubts were started as to the success of such a serious undertaking, when a true Christian nobleman, von Bethmann Hollweg, who was subsequently elected President, of the Kirchentag, quieted their fears and re-animated the courage by pointing to the never failing source of all true strength. "It is the Lord, my friends," he said, "who builds the Church. Never forget this! Whether the assembly spoken of will accomplish what we desire and hope, no one can tell. Our resolution must be an act of faith. Like Peter, we shall have to walk on the sea; but we know also that the Lord does not suffer any one to perish who trusts in him. If we look merely upon ourselves and upon the scattered, distracted and weak members of the Church, we would have indeed to despair. But if we raise our eyes in faith to Him, who is the Lord, we may venture it."

Finally, the Sandhof Conference, after a session of nine hours, resolved to call a general free assembly of distinguished ministers and laymen of the Lutheran, German Reformed, and United confession, to be held at Wittenberg, over the grave of Luther, for the purpose of consulting on the true interests of the evangelical Church of Germany at the present crisis, on the basis of the evangelical faith. An invitation to this effect was issued, signed by nearly fifty names from all parts of Germany, well known for their high standing and excellent Christian character.

Accordingly the first Kirchentag, consisting of five hundred members, eminent divines and ministers, (Nitzsch, Müller, Heubner, Hengstenberg, Lehnerdt, Sack, Sartorius, Krummacher, Ball, Wichern, etc.) statesmen and lawyers, (von Bethmann Hollweg, Stahl, von Gerlach, Götze, etc.,) and plain Christians of all classes of society and parts of Germany, especially from Prussia, met as one brotherhood on the 21st of September, 1848, in that venerable town so well known as the cradle of the Reformation, in that very church to whose doors its signal, the ninety-five thesis, were once affixed; and on the tombstones of Luther and his friend, Melanthon, whose last desire and

prayer was for the unity of distracted Christendom. The old lecturer's chair of the former University was used as the rostrum, adorned with the portrait of Luther and with the significant motto of the Reformation, "*Verbo solo—fide sola*," (On the word alone—through faith alone). A fervent prayer of the late venerable Dr. Heubner, then President of the Theological Seminary at Wittenberg, and the singing of the celebrated war-and-victory hymn of the evangelical faith, written by Luther a year before the Diet of Augsburg, opened the proceedings. It faithfully expressed the feelings which pervaded this first meeting from beginning to end, much better than we could do it, and may, therefore, claim a place here in the admirable translation of Thomas Carlyle.

A safe stronghold our God is still,
A trusty shield and weapon ;
He'll help us clear from all the ill
That hath us now o'ertaken.
The ancient Prince of hell
Hath risen with purpose fell,
Strong mail of craft and power
He weareth in this hour,
On earth is not his fellow.

With force of arms we nothing can,
Full soon were we down-ridden ;
But for us fights the proper man,
Whom God himself hath bidden.
Ask ye, Who is this same ?
CHRIST JESUS is his name,
The Lord Zebaoth's Son,
He, and no other one,
Shall conquer in the battle.

And were the world all Devils o'er
And watching to devour us,
We lay it not to heart so sore,
Not they can overpower us.
And let the Prince of ill
Look grim as e'er he will,
He harms us not a whit,
For why ? His doom is writ—
A word shall quickly slay him.

God's word, for all their craft and force,
One moment will not linger,
But spite of hell, shall have its course,
'Tis written by His finger.
And though they take our life,
Goods, honor, children, wife,
Yet is their profit small;
These things shall vanish all,
The Church of God remaineth.

The significance of this hymn and its thrilling effect on that occasion, will be better understood, if we recollect all the revolutionary storms, wars and rumors of war, by which the first German Church Diet was surrounded. The frightful murder of Lichnowsky and Auerswald, had just been committed in the streets of Frankfort, and broken the remaining moral weight of the national assembly; the excesses of the revolutionists and destructionists had reached their height, and the future looked dark and gloomy as it never did before. With such prospects before them, the assembly at Wittenberg felt the whole weight of its awful responsibility; past differences were forgotten, and the disciples of one common Master pressed together into a close adhesion and holy brotherhood as they awaited the issue of their own yet dimly apprehended mission. Surrounded, as they were, by the sacred associations of the most remarkable period in modern Church history, they looked less to Luther's name, so long abused by dead Churches, than to Luther's God, and were animated by the very spirit of repentance and faith, of humble self-distrust and strong confidence in Christ which had animated the reformer, without suffering themselves to be distracted by the minor domestic controversies which disfigured the great work of the sixteenth century.

"It was," says a well informed and esteemed English friend, on this meeting, (Mr. Tho. H. Gladstone, in an article on the Kirchentag for the London Eclectic Review, April, 1855)—"it was indeed a new and interesting sight to behold the learned professor seated side by side with the simple-minded Christian, the dignified ecclesiastic taking

brotherly counsel with the humble lay-missionary or provincial school teacher. It was no less a strangely novel spectacle to see the strongest upholders of the respective orthodoxies, Lutheran and Reformed, forgetting doctrinal differences in the harmony of Christian purpose and Christian love; still more to see the object of their common jealousy, the "United" Church, as well as the Moravian and other dissenting communities, completing the picture of Christian union and brotherly love by being admitted to their association without question of their ecclesiastical polity or Church rule. All seemed to point to the dawning of a better day. And the tempest of persecution with which the Church was assailed, appeared already converted into a blessing, in the recognition of its essential unity, and the sense of the mutual dependence of its parts as members of that mystic body which is one in its living Head. This feeling of Christian fellowship was heightened to the sublime, and received an expression too deeply affecting ever to be erased from the memory of those who witnessed the scene, when, at a solemn moment on the last day, the earnest Krummacher, in one of his fervent addresses, pledged the members to stand true to one another in the day of persecution, which seemed about to burst upon them, and received in the prolonged affirmation of the whole assembly, the assurance that they would bear each other as members of one family in their hearts and prayers, would receive each other in the day of persecution to house and home till the storm should be overpast, and would account as their own sister and their own children the widows and orphans of the brother who should seal his testimony by the martyr's death."

The results to which this deeply solemn and interesting assembly arrived in three days session (from the 21st to the 23rd of Sept.,) were:

1. An invitation addressed to all the Protestant Churches of Germany, to hold on the 5th of November, 1848, the Sunday following the anniversary of the Reformation, a day of general prayer and humiliation, in order to be-

gin the work of the regeneration of Protestantism with the same spirit of true evangelical repentance, with which Luther commenced the Reformation, and which he so clearly expressed in the very first of his ninety-five theses.

2. The resolution to form a confederation of all those German Churches which stand on the ground of the reformatory confessions, not for the purpose of an amalgamation of these Churches and an extinction of their peculiarities and relative independence, but (a) for the representation and promotion of the essential unity and brotherly harmony of the evangelical Churches; (b) for united testimony against every thing unevangelical; (c) for mutual counsel and aid; (d) for the decision of controversies; (e) for the furtherance of ecclesiastical and social reforms, especially Inner Missions; (f) for the protection and defense of the divine and human rights and liberties of the evangelical Church; (g) for forming and promoting the bond of union with all evangelical bodies out of Germany.

We see from all this, that the first Kirchentag was animated by a truly Christian spirit, placed itself wisely on the most solid basis, viz: the Gospel and the Reformation, evangelical repentance and evangelical faith, and proposed the noblest practical aims, which are well worthy of the united efforts of all Protestant Churches, in and out of Germany. It is evident, from its subsequent history, that the Lord has eminently blessed it for the good of his Church, although its original plan was considerably modified.

But before we follow its progress, we must say a few words on the relation of the Church Diet to a somewhat similar body, the Evangelical Alliance. This originated two years earlier, in August, 1846. It met first under the name of the "World's Convention," in the city of London, and consisted of nine hundred and twenty-one members; forty seven of which were from the Continent, eighty-seven from North America, the rest from England and Scotland. It convened again in London during the World's Fair, in 1851, a third time at Paris, in 1855, and is to meet at Berlin in 1857, at the special invitation of the King of Prussia.

Both the Kirchentag and the Alliance are no union of Churches, but a union of Christians, laymen as well as ministers, no legislative assembly, but simply a free association with moral power. Both afford an admirable occasion for Christians from all parts of the world, to hold fellowship and consult with each other about the common interests of the Redeemer's kingdom. Both tend thus to promote the true unity of the spirit, and to strengthen the interests of divided Protestantism. But they differ at the same time in the following points:

1.) The one is an essentially German, the other an essentially English and Scotch plant.

2.) The former has at least a *semi*-official character, and looked at first to a confederation of the Churches of the Reformation, which the latter never contemplated.

3.) The Kirchentag is an association simply of four denominations, Lutheran, German Reformed, United, and Moravian, although it received delegates also from foreign evangelical bodies, while the Alliance at its first meeting, was composed of representatives of about fifty denominations, amongst which the Scotch Presbyterians and the English Baptists seem to have had thus far the controlling influence.

4.) The Kirchentag never pretended to make a new creed, but took for its doctrinal basis the Bible and the original Confessions of evangelical Protestantism from the period of the Reformation; while the Alliance issued a new symbol in 1846, consisting of nine short articles, which express the fundamental doctrines of Protestantism, in such a manner as to exclude none of the leading Protestant sects except Unitarians, Universalists, and Quakers.

5.) The Kirchentag aims at an internal regeneration of Protestantism over against infidelity and vice within its own borders; while the Alliance had from the beginning a special reference to the foreign foes, and intended to erect a bulwark against the progress of Romanism and Puseyism.

6.) The Kirchentag is more extensive and practical in its operation, as it embraces all the important questions of the time and the whole field of Inner Mission; while the Alliance con-

fined itself so far mainly to the preparation of reports on the condition of the various Churches of Christendom, and to the promotion of religious liberty throughout the world, in opposition to the intolerant and persecuting spirit of Rome.

Since 1848, the Kirchentag met every year in September, with the exception of 1855, when it would have assembled at Halle, according to appointment, had it not been providentially prevented by the sudden appearance of the cholera in that city. The following is a list of the places of meeting, with the number of regular attendants, exclusive of the large crowd of spectators :

1. Wittenberg,	a. 1848,	members about	500
2. Wittenberg,	1849,	" "	700
3. Stuttgart,	1850,	" "	2000
4. Elberfeld,	1851,	" "	1800
5. Bremen.	1852,	" "	1400
6. Berlin,	1853,	" "	2000
7. Frankfort-on-the-			
Maine,	1854,	" "	1800
8. Lübeck,	1856,	" "	400

The next Kirchentag is to take place, on urgent invitation, at Stuttgart in 1857 or 1858, as the central committee may decide. The fluctuation in attendance is owing mostly to the local situation of the respective places. The small number of regular members at Lübeck, for instance, can easily be accounted for, partly by the extreme Northern location of this city, and partly by the raging of the cholera in it a short time before the meeting took place. We are confident, that should Providence not prevent the proposed assembly at Stuttgart, the large Stifts-Kirche will be crowded to overflowing, and the members will be as hospitably and affectionately entertained as in 1850.

As to the general nature of these meetings, they have far less of a business character, but are much more instructive and edifying than our Synodical assemblies. They are exclusively occupied with spiritual affairs and have nothing to do with money matters and cases of discipline, which unavoidably take up so much time in our self-governing

legislative Church-councils. The Kirchentag lasts four days, two of which are devoted to the congress of Inner Mission, of which we shall say more hereafter. Dr. von Bethmann Hollweg and Prof. Stahl, were annually re-elected Presidents, except at Frankfort, where Dr. Hoffman took the place of the absent Stahl. The business of the Kirchentag during the year is managed by the select central committee, the principal members of which, von Bethmann Hollweg, Stahl, Nitzsch, Hengstenberg, Snethlage, Hoffman, von Mühler, Jordan, reside in Berlin. They select the principal topics for discussion, and the speakers or reporters six months before the meeting, so as to give them full time for careful preparation. At the day and hour appointed these speakers read their papers on the subjects assigned them. Then follows a free discussion, and if necessary, a resolution for the adoption of measures proposed for the carrying out of the object in view. Owing to the great number of speakers, they must generally be limited to five or ten minutes. Some standing delegates, as Wichern, Krummacher, Sander, Stahl, Nitzsch, Kapff, speak often; others, who are equally well known, as Hundeshagen, Ullmann, Rothe, Bähr, prefer to sit silent. There is also room given, for short addresses, to the delegates from foreign Churches and religious societies. The official minutes contain the reports in full, and an abstract of the debates and proceedings. We need not add, that devotional exercises open and close each session, and that most, if not all, the pulpits of the place of meeting, are filled by distinguished orators every evening and during the intervening Sunday.

Besides the general sessions, a number of separate sessions are held early in the morning and late in the evening for particular objects connected with the Kirchentag, as the promotion of the better observance of Sunday, the reform of prisoners and prison-discipline, the establishment of houses of refuge, the cultivation of religious art, etc.

Finally, the Kirchentag has become the nucleus and occasion for the meetings of the Reformed Conference, of

Missionary, Bible, Tract, and other benevolent Societies, so that it is impossible for the most anxious and persevering visitor to attend more than one third of these gatherings. The excitement and commotion is so great, that it would be better to extend the Diet over one or two weeks, instead of condensing such a large amount of religious life and social enjoyment into the short space of four days.

It would lead us far beyond our proposed limits to give a detailed account of all the meetings of the Kirchentag from the first held at Wittenberg to that of Lübeck. We must confine ourselves to the principal topics of interest in the last three meetings.

The Church Diet of Berlin, in 1853, was the most important of all in a doctrinal point of view. For it solemnly and almost unanimously adopted the Augsburg Confession of 1530, as the fundamental symbol (*Grund-Symbol*) of the entire Evangelical Church of Germany in all its branches, with the distinct understanding, however, that the tenth article on the Lord's Supper, should not exclude the Reformed doctrine on the subject, and that this whole act should not interfere at all with the peculiar position of those Reformed Churches which never adopted the Augsburg Confession. The measure was supported by Sartorius and Stahl, in the name of the Lutheran, by Krummacher, in the name of the Reformed, and by Nitzsch, in the name of the United Church. After a very interesting discussion, which occupied the whole of the 20th of September, the two thousand members who filled the garrison church of the Prussian capital, signified, almost with one heart and one mouth, their assent to the most venerable and most catholic Confession of Geaman Protestantism, and then burst out in the German *Te Deum*, "*Nun danket alle Gott.*" The joyful news of the decision was carried with the greatest haste to the King, who received it with every expression of delight, and was hailed with enthusiasm by the pious Protestants throughout Germany, while the Roman Catholics were disagreeably surprised by this unexpected testimony of doctrinal unity and strength among their opponents.

This act of confession, coming from such a vast assembly, including the most respected and influential men from all parts of Germany, was no doubt a powerful protest against Romanism, and still more against Rationalism, and marks an epoch in the history of German Protestantism.

And yet while we concede the great importance of this fact for Germany and for Lutheranism, we are not in the least surprised that some Reformed members present, as the late Dr. Henry, the author of the life of Calvin, Prof. Heppe, of Marburg, and Dr. Merle d'Aubigne, of the city of Calvin, were not altogether satisfied, and would have greatly preferred the resolution, if, instead of simply guarding the Reformed conscience in reference to the interpretation of the Augustana, it would have included a formal recognition of the Heidelberg Catechism, or the Helvetic Confession, or some other Reformed symbol. Dr. Merle, the author of the popular history of the Reformation, abstained from voting, and in an interesting speech, after bestowing due praise upon the Augsburg Confession, made some significant remarks from the stand-point of general Protestant Christianity against German and Lutheran sectionalism. "I have no objection," he said, "to the Augustana, nor to the Lutheran Church, which I honor and love like a child, having learned much from Luther and his associates. But I fear an excess in the Lutheran spirit, and can, therefore, wish it nothing better than an intimate confederation—I do not say union which has a peculiar technical sense—with the believing, living and more free Reformed Church. I fear first the increase of a traditional, ceremonial, hierarchical element in Lutheranism, which may all be found in much greater perfection in the Church of Rome; and secondly, an isolation from, and condemnation of other children of God who live of the same Word of God. Luther had two hands, the one with which he turned off Zwingli at Marburg, that was his left hand; and the other with which he signed the Wittenberg Concordia, that was his right hand. And finally, I fear that Lutheranism may withdraw too much from practical life. Its

passivity must be melted with the activity of the Reformed Christians. Three great colossi of mankind are now shaken to the very base, Mohammedanism, India and China; and in every case Reformed Christianity has a hand. The Reformed element has grown mightily since the Reformation. A mustard seed then, it is now a large tree, spreading its branches over the face of the globe. The modern progress of Christianity in Great Britain and North America is especially astounding. The sceptre of the future development of humanity lies in the hands of the Reformed Confession. Now, my dear Lutheran brethren, let us rather unite under the banner of our common Head for the conversion of the world, with the inscription: *Hoc signo vinces!* As far as I am concerned, I would place the Gallicana, or the Helvetica, or the Heidelbergensis, on a par with the Augustana. But whatever you may do, let us who are redeemed by the blood of atonement, members of all confessions to the ends of the earth, be one in the Father, in the Son and in the Holy Ghost."

The seventh Church Diet, held at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, in 1854, September 22nd to 27th, derived special importance from the variety and fulness of its reports, as well as from the place of meeting in the old imperial city, in whose immediate neighborhood (the Sandhof) the Kirchentag itself was born six years before, and in the same church of St. Paul, where, in 1848 and 1849, the famous Parliament discussed, with the assembled learning of German professors and patriots, the political regeneration and reorganization of Germany on the basis of liberty and unity, and where, in August, 1850, the representatives from Europe and America held the third General Peace Congress. This building was thus within a few short years the witness of angry debate and of heavenly worship, of political clamor and the eloquence of peace and good will to the Church and the world. Of the sixteen hundred and sixteen published names of regular members, eleven hundred and twenty were theologians and ministers, and four hundred and ninety six laymen, of all ranks of society, and from all parts of

Germany and foreign countries. A dense crowd of spectators of ladies and gentlemen filled the galleries at every session. The evening sermons which were preached in the different churches of the city by Krummacher, Tholuck, Hoffmann, Kapff, Bahrdt, Mallet, Ebrard, Sander, Grandpierre, and other distinguished pulpit orators, were so largely attended, that hundreds had to return home for want of room. This fact may show what a salutary influence this assembly may exert upon the place of its meeting, as well as upon the hundreds and thousands of visitors from abroad.

The first paper read before the Frankfort Church Diet, after the introductory services and the annual report of the President, von Bethmann Hollweg, was a most able, pointed and stirring essay of about two hours length, on the right use of the Bible in the church, the school and the family, by the Rev. Dr. W. Hoffmann, now court preacher and general superintendent of Berlin. The speaker declared the whole Bible, from beginning to end, (exclusive of the Apocrypha) to be the Word of God in human form and speech, an organic whole, unfolding the divine plan of redemption, the infallible rule of faith and practice, and pointed out the ways and means by which a universal Bible-custom (*Bibel-sitte*) and a universal Bible-life (*Bibel-leben*) should be introduced into all the churches, schools, and families of Germany. He advised the ministers to study the whole Bible, not only from commentaries, but on the old principle of the self-interpretation of Scriptures, and on their knees, so as to be filled with the Holy Ghost and with the majesty and power of the Word of the living God. Then their sermons will be truly scriptural, i. e., not merely quote passages from the Bible, but unfold its great ideas and realities of the divine plan of redemption, bring near the powers of the world to come, and make the Word of God alive in the hearts of the hearers. Concerning the third point he said, Every Christian household should become an *ecclesiola in ecclesia*, a temple of the living God. There never yet was a Bible-life, in the full sense of the

term, in the families of the Church, except by way of exception. Before the invention of the art of printing, it was impossible; the Reformation made an attempt to introduce it, but could not carry it through. But now, when a copy of the Bible is in almost every family, it can and ought to be fully realized, that it may exert its sanctifying influence over all branches and ranks of society, and make the German nation emphatically the people of God in the new dispensation. Thus the Church would cease to be merely a Church of theologians and preachers, and become truly a Church of the people. The meetings of the Church Diet would become free feasts of thanksgiving and praise to the great Author of the book of books. Let us all wish and pray that He may kindle this Bible-life amongst us and make it shine in all its pentecostal glory.—This address was exceedingly well received, and ordered to be extensively circulated, so as to reach, if possible, every minister, school-master and father of a family.

The second report by Dr. Julius Müller, of Halle, assisted by Advocate Thesmar of Cologne, related to the law of divorce, a subject of great practical importance for Germany, and wound up with the resolutions which were unanimously adopted: 1.) That the civil governments of Protestant Germany be respectfully requested to reform the matrimonial legislation, and to abolish all causes of divorce not sanctioned by the word of God. 2.) That the Protestant clergy decline to marry such persons as had been divorced on unscriptural grounds. This subject was subsequently agitated in the Prussian Chambers, and the result was, that at last, some of the fourteen, say fourteen reasons of divorce which the Prussian *Landrecht* recognizes since Frederick II, were abolished. But there is great room for additional improvement in this direction all over Germany.

Then followed an interesting and animated discussion on infant baptism, introduced by an original essay of Dr. Steinmeyer, of Bonn, without leading, however, to any definite results.

Dr. Wichern, of the Rough House, near Hamburg, open-

ed the Congress for Inner Mission on the third day, in his usual fervent and heart-stirring manner, with a lengthy, instructive and encouraging report on the great theme of his life. He discoursed, out of the fullness of his experience, and enthusiasm, on the training of laborers for Inner Mission; on the propriety of forming evangelical brotherhoods and sisterhoods, without the Romish addition of vows, celibacy and meritorious works; on new institutions for destitute children; on the recent labors for promoting family worship, the sanctification of Sunday, for providing every married couple with a copy of the Bible; on the spiritual care of the poor, the orphans, sailors, emigrants, mechanics, and destitute classes of society; on prison discipline, the temperance movement; in fact on nearly every topic of moral reform and Christian charity, which now arrests the attention of serious and benevolent men in Germany.

The ecclesiastical care of the poor, next occupied the attention, on the basis of a paper presented by superintendent Lengerich of Pomerania.

Then came, on the fourth day of the session, a most valuable and popularly written report of Prelate Dr. Kapff, of Stuttgart, against gambling houses and lotteries. It is a notorious fact, that two or three little German governments disgrace themselves by tolerating, for filthy lucre's sake, faro-banks in fashionable watering places, especially Baden-Baden, and Homburg, to the temporal and moral ruin of hundreds of families. One of the best acts of the unfortunate German Parliament of Frankfort was the abolition of these miserable establishments in January 8th, 1849. But with the triumph of political re-action, they were restored, and even increased in number. The Electorate of Hesse sanctioned in 1853, or 1854, four new ones (Neuheim, Hofgeismar, Wilhelmsbad and Neundorf); and yet this government, then under the control of the unpopular Hassenpflug, (called by his enemies *Hessenfluch*, also *Hass und Fluch*,) wanted to be pre-eminently Christian, abusing the holy name of order and of Christianity for the promotion of political tyranny and bigotted churchism!

It was, therefore, highly proper, that the assembled piety of Germany should give free utterance to the indignation of all good men against this abomination, and this, too, at Frankfort, which lies in the immediate neighborhood of these gambling-hells. The Church Diet unanimously, and without any discussion, resolved upon a petition to the respective governments for the suppression of all games of hazzard, faro-banks and lotteries, within the limits of the German confederation. The petition was favorably acted upon by the *Bundestag* of Frankfort, but the miserable little governments, basing themselves upon their sovereignty, refused, thus far, to abolish those nurseries of vice and misery. Prussia alone promptly responded to the appeal of the Kirchentag, and at once suppressed the gambling establishments at Aix-la-Chappelle.

The last session of the Frankfort meeting was devoted to the consideration of the relation of the evangelical Churches of Germany to the German Churches of America, and the spiritual care of the German emigrants. The writer of this article, then on a visit in Europe, had been requested to prepare the report on this subject; and spoke of the general significance of America for the future development of Christianity and civilization; of the particular mission of the German evangelical Churches in the United States; and finally on the duty of the mother Church in Europe toward her daughter in America, and especially toward the thousands and hundreds of thousands of emigrants who annually flock to our shores, to become either a disgrace, or an honor to their native country, and a curse, or a blessing to their adopted home, according to the moral and religious character they bring with them from Germany. In the discussion which followed, and in which Kapff, Krummacher, Sander, Kaiser, Conze, Grandpierre, of Paris, Cappadose, of the Hague, von Bethmann Hollweg, and others, took part, the kindest Christian interest was expressed in the state and progress of Christianity in the new world, and a new impulse given to the societies and efforts which have for their object to provide for the spirit-

ual destitution of the German emigrants, and to make them good citizens and pious Christians. The meeting unanimously resolved to enter into fraternal correspondence, and as far as possible into an exchange of delegates with the German and Anglo-German Churches of America, and concluded with the solemn singing of Zinzendorf's beautiful hymn on the union of all believers, alluded to at the close of the preceding report, ("Lass uns so vereinigt werden, Wie Du mit dem Vater bist," etc.)

The resolution was subsequently carried out. The officers of the Church Diet sent a truly Christian and fraternal address written by the president, Dr. von Bethmann Hollweg, to all the American Churches of German descent and evangelical profession, which are also represented in the Church Diet, namely, the Lutheran, German Reformed, Evangelical United, and Moravian. The letter was responded to in the same spirit. The German Reformed Church, at its Synodical meeting held at Chambersburg in 1855, sent not only a written reply, but also three delegates, two clergymen, (Rev. Dr. Schneck and Rev. B. Bausman) and a lay-elder (Mr. Griffith) to the Church Diet at Lübeck. This fact is now recorded in history as a delightful testimony of the communion of faith and love which in spite of the ocean, still binds together the Churches of the German and Swiss Reformation and their children and brethren in the new world, whither the star of Christ's kingdom is taking its way. Besides there are important practical interests which strongly recommend such a correspondence. For the German Churches, on both sides of the Atlantic, ought certainly to cooperate in bringing the large and increasing tide of German emigration to America under Gospel-influences, and giving it such a direction and shape as to make it an honor to their old, and a blessing to their new home. It is to be desired, that the General Synod of the Lutheran Church of the United States, at its next meeting, should imitate the example of the German Reformed Church, and have itself represented by a personal delegation at the next Kirchentag of Stuttgart, where it may confidently expect a most warm-hearted Christian welcome.

The eighth Church Diet, having failed to meet at Halle in 1855, on account of the sudden outbreak of a violent epidemic, took place in the free city of Lübeck, in the extreme North of Germany, in September, 1856. For local and other reasons, it was apprehended by many, that this meeting would prove a failure, especially since it was known, that the cholera had raged there during the summer. But this fear was not realized. The attendance, it is true, was much smaller than at any previous meeting, especially from the central, western, and southern regions of Germany. Still it was a respectable and imposing assembly of about four hundred clergymen and pious laymen. Several foreign countries and Churches also, as the Free Church of Scotland, the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, the Reformed Churches of Holland and France, besides various benevolent societies were worthily represented. The three delegates of the German Reformed Church of America were all on the spot, and express themselves in their official and private reports highly delighted with all the proceedings, as well as with their personal reception. Concord and harmony reigned from beginning to end. The distracting Church question, which agitates at present the Prussian establishment to its very centre, and on which even the presiding officers of the Kirchentag are by no means entirely agreed, was fortunately not permitted to disturb the truly Christian tone and feeling, or to overshadow the essential agreement in all the fundamental articles of the Christian faith. The subjects, although not of such absorbing interest, as on former occasions, were judiciously selected and ably discussed.

The first topic related to the revival of evangelical Church-discipline, and was opened by a veteran divine, Dr. Sack, formerly professor at Bonn, now Consistorial-rath at Magdeburg, a son of the Reformed court-preacher in Berlin, who was one of the chief promoters of the Union in Prussia in 1817.

Discipline, we are sorry to say, has almost entirely ceased in Germany, and it is difficult to see how it ever can be

properly exercised, as long as the Church remains so intimately interwoven with the State, and as long as the sick and dead members so far outnumber the living Christians. The State-Church system drills every body mechanically into the Church, but permits them afterwards to believe and profess and act as they please. The State cares only for the outward appearance and the legal aspect of the case, but cannot produce an inward change, and the Church, which is the proper moral and religious agent, is constantly cramped in its free action by the secular government, and not unfrequently paralyzed by the bad example of the head of the State, who is at the same time the *summus episcopus* of the Church. In Würtemberg, for instance, excommunication for adultery sake, would have to commence with the King, who is generally known to be habitually addicted to that grievous sin.

On the second day, Dr. Schmieder, the successor of the venerable Dr. Heubner, and head of the Theological Seminary of Wittenberg, read a lengthy address on the call to the ministry. Our German brethren complain both of the want of efficient, and an excess of indifferent ministers. This evil is likewise to be attributed, in part, at least, to the close union of Church and State. Many study for the sacred office merely from utilitarian and mercenary motives, to the injury of the Church and themselves, while many, who have the proper spirit, refuse to obey the internal call, to the loss of religion. The clergy proceed almost exclusively from the middle and lower classes. Count Zinzendorf still remains almost a solitary example of a missionary nobleman. The cause of this sad fact was found in the prevalence of materialism among the higher classes, the love of gain, and an aversion to the solemn duties of the ministry. The excellent pastor Meyer, of Paris, remarked, that there were at present twenty-three vacant parishes in the Reformed Church of France; that they had the son of a wealthy banker who served as a faithful village-pastor; and that they had many excellent ministers, who were the children of street-sweepers. "If they only come," he said,

"we care not whether they come from above or below. Yes, let them come from *above, far above*, from the Lord and head of the Church."

The third topic of discussion was the question, How shall the Church oppose the influence of materialism in modern natural science upon the masses? Dr. Fabri, the author of the "*Briefe gegen den Materialismus*," 1856, one of the very best refutations of this latest form of infidelity, had been very properly selected for the leading report, and seems to have done full justice to his theme.

It is a singular fact, that, after a temporary stagnation of philosophical speculation in Germany, a crude materialism should suddenly spring up, proclaiming in the name of the natural sciences, the irreconcilable contradiction between geology and astronomy with the Bible, and flatly denying the very existence of an immortal spirit. This seems to be the opposite extreme to the transcendental idealism which formerly prevailed, and yet there is a connecting link between the two in such books as Feuerbach's *Wesen des Christenthums*. But to the credit of Germany, it must be said, that quite a number of works, both scientific and popular, have already appeared against this pseudo-philosophy of a Vogt, Moleschot, Burmeister, Büchner and other infidel naturalists of the day.

Fabri takes the ground, that materialism is no philosophy at all; that it must logically end in nihilism; that it must be met, not with governmental coercion, but with the weapons of reason; that theology and natural science do not necessarily contradict each other, but can be harmonized without torturing any of their principles or data. Dr. Stahl, in the discussion, denied that materialism was a product of Protestantism, as it existed under the papacy long before the reformation. Much as he respected and admired the investigations of science in the sphere of nature, he regarded it as transcending its reasonable limits, when it presumed to define and explain the domain of spiritual and eternal truth. It can discover planets, but it cannot tell us whether they are inhabited. It can invent

the telegraph, but it cannot explain the essence of electricity, much less the hidden mysteries of God.

The last days, as usual, were devoted to the discussion of the various benevolent operations of the Congress for Inner Mission. Here the most important and interesting part was an address of Dr. Wichern, nearly three hours in length, on the sphere of woman in the evangelical Church, where the distinguished Christian philanthropist gave a graphic picture of the present position, trials, claims and duties of woman.

As already remarked, the next meeting of the Kirchentag is to be held in Stuttgart, either in 1857 or 1858, as the central committee on further deliberation may deem best.

We think it likely, that the meeting will be put off till 1858, for in the autumn of 1857 the Evangelical Alliance will assemble for the first time on German ground and attract no doubt a great deal of attention. Some of the best friends of the Church Diet believe that it will sooner or later be brought to a close either by the course of events which may supersede it, or by the growing confessional strife and doctrinal exclusiveness which is averse to union and confederation of different confessions. Some of its leading members and founders, as Stahl and Hengstenberg, become more high Church Lutherans every year, and are alienated in the same proportion from their brethren who occupy United or Reformed ground. In 1855, it was apprehended also, that the burning political difference on the Russian and Turkish question which divided the two presidents, Dr. von Bethmann Hollweg and Prof. Stahl in the Prussian Chambers, might seriously overcloud or break up the proposed meeting at Halle, which, however, was providentially prevented. The Eastern war is now concluded and with it the bitter controversy to which it gave rise. But the general political difference between the monarchical absolutism of the high Church Lutherans, and the constitutional liberalism of the Reformed and the moderate Unionists still exists, and the controversy about ecclesiastical union or disunion rages more fiercely than ever in Northern Germany, especially in Prussia.

But no one can tell what may take place in the short space of one year. Events may happen in Germany, which will show the necessity of a closer union amongst evangelical Christians even more strongly, than the revolutionary storms of 1848, which gave rise to the Church Diet. Besides, it has a host of friends, who will do all they can to keep it up. In Würtemberg especially, which has stood aloof so far from the confessional war, the Church Diet is universally popular among the pious of the laity, as well as of the clergy, and the proposed meeting at Stuttgart, though it should be the last, will be one of the most enthusiastic, a worthy end of a worthy beginning.

But whatever be the final fate of this assembly, it has already a glorious history of nine years, and forms one of the most interesting and encouraging chapters in the annals of Protestantism.

This leads us to sum up, in conclusion, the benefits and results of the Church Diet.

As regards the official and authoritative confederation of all the Protestant State-Churches of Germany, which the Diet proposed at its first meeting in Wittenberg, as a safeguard against the fearful dangers and evils of that particular time, we must say, that this object has not been attained, and was almost entirely lost sight of in its subsequent meetings. The sudden changes in the political condition of Germany, the defeat of the revolutionists and anarchists, and the restoration of the old order of things, are the immediate causes of this failure. But the idea of one evangelical Church in Germany still lives, and may perhaps be realized better in the end on the ruins, than on the basis of the existing rotten establishments. On the other hand, it may be questioned, whether such an official confederation of Churches is at all desirable, and whether the mission of Protestantism, for the present at least, lies not rather in the direction of a free, voluntary association of Christians in their individual capacity. At all events, the past and present power of the Church Diet rests on the principle of a free association and communion, while by passing over into

an official body, it would have become inevitably connected with all the evils of State-Churchism.

In some sense, however, the desired confederation may be said to exist in a body distinct from the Kirchentag, but called into existence by its influence. We mean the Conference of Eisenach, which consists of a small number of official delegates from the various Church governments of Protestant Germany, and meets since 1852, annually or bi-annually, as circumstances may require, at Eisenach, for consultation on subjects and measures of common interest to all. But its deliberations are private and subject to the final sanction or rejection of the respective authorities. The most important work of this Conference, so far, is the preparation and publication of one hundred and fifty standard hymns, with their melodies, for public worship, which should form the nucleus of the hymn-books of the different Churches and thus promote unity in the place of the endless confusion produced by the arbitrary alterations of hymns and chorals.

In the mean time the Church Diet has accomplished, in a free form and altogether independent of State-control, much more than an official State-Church-confederation, in all probability, would have done under similar circumstances. Deprived of legislative authority and even pecuniary means, the Kirchentag had all the moral power of faith and truth speaking in love, of remonstrance with the authorities and of appeal to the people at large. It exerted a most salutary influence upon the cities and neighborhoods in which it met. It travelled like a living evangelist to the centres of leading influence in Germany. It gave a powerful impulse to the course of evangelical piety and active Christianity all over the land. It discussed topics and started measures of the greatest theoretical and practical moment. Several of these were already mentioned above. To them must be added, from previous meetings, the discussions on Christian education, the relation of Church and State, the political duties of ministers, the sanctification of Sunday, the reform of worship, the introduction of a com-

mon hymn-book for all Germany, the relation of voluntary societies to the ministerial office, the Romish question, the treatment of dissenters, the spiritual care of the poor, the emigrants, the prisoners, the travelling journeymen, etc. It interceded in behalf of the persecuted Madii at Florence, in connection with English and French Protestants, and protested against several crying abuses in certain countries of Germany. It has become a nucleus for a large number of benevolent and reformatory societies which cluster around it. It has promoted the cause of Christian union, not only at home, but also abroad, by receiving delegates from, and forming connections with the Protestant Churches of France, Holland, Belgium, Scotland, Geneva, the Canton de Vaud, the British Evangelical Alliance, the American Tract Society, and the German Churches of America.

But one work must be mentioned with special praise, which may be called the adopted child of the Kirchentag, and has been most fruitful and blessed in immediate results. We mean the cause of "Inner Mission," to which it devotes two days, or fully one half of the time of its annual meetings. This is undoubtedly one of the most important movements of the age, and is alone sufficient to immortalize that assembly in the history of practical Christianity and Christian philanthropy. The term, Inner Mission, comprehends much more than what we mean by Home Missions, or Domestic Missions. It aims at a relief of all kinds of spiritual and temporal misery by works of faith and charity, at a revival of nominal Christendom, and a general reform of society on the basis of the Gospel and the creed of the Reformation. It is Christian philanthropy and charity applied to the various deep-rooted evils of society, as they were brought to light so fearfully in Germany by the revolutionary outbreaks of 1848. It comprises the care of the poor, the sick, the captive and prisoner, the laboring classes, the travelling journeymen, the emigrants, the temperance movement, the efforts for the pro-

motion of a better observance of the Lord's day, and similar reforms, so greatly needed in the Churches of Europe.

Dr. Wichern is the chief author and moving spirit of this great work in its modern German form. For as to its essence, of course, it is as old as Christian charity itself. It was with considerable difficulty, and only after a most eloquent speech, that he succeeded in urging it upon the serious attention of the Church Diet at its first meeting in 1848, and in making it one of its regular and principal objects. The movement spread with wonderful rapidity. There is now hardly a city in Protestant Germany or Switzerland, where there is not a "Society for Inner Mission," or an "Evangelical Association" for the promotion of the various works of Christian benevolence. "That which, seven years ago"—says an English philanthropist—"was a germ of thought lodged in the mind of one man, is now a principle actuating human minds, instigating Christian endeavors, and giving birth to benevolent enterprise in a hundred forms throughout the fatherland, and wherever, in Europe, in America, or in Australasia, Germany may find a home." Dr. Wichern presents a general survey of the progress of the work at every meeting of the Kirchentag, and urges to renewed efforts with ever fresh vigor and with an earnestness and enthusiasm that is not from this earth.

We cannot better conclude this article, than by quoting the last words of Wichern's report at the Church Diet of Frankfort. "The Inner Mission," says this great and good man, "is the work of John, not the Baptist, but the apostle who leaned on the bosom of the Lord. According to the word of this apostle, we should all love each other as brethren, who confess the only saving name of Christ. But in this brotherly love we should also burn, like John, in the pursuit of the apostate youth, for the recovery of those who are wandering on the abyss of destruction. The love of God shed abroad in our hearts, uniting the disciples into one body, going forth like a burning light into the world, and converting the dreary deserts round about us into a paradise of God—such Johannean love is the hope

and the strength of Inner Mission. May God bless this work, in midst of envy and strife, for the establishment of peace."

Mercersburg, Pa.

P. S.

ART. II.—THE ANATOMY OF SENTIMENTALISM.

SENTIMENTALISM and the SENTIMENTALIST—Etymologically considered, the words seem fair enough, and plain enough; their descent from *sentio*, to *feel*, is quite respectable; in their genealogy they are allied to thought (*sentiment*) on the one side, and may claim a still nearer kindred with *taste*, *aesthetics*, *αἰσθησις*, on the other. And yet we all somehow *feel*, in using them, that they are bad words, and denote a bad thing. We *feel* right in this respect. The unconscious or instinctive logic, as we may call it, is justified by a careful examination of the phrase and the idea. In accounting for this loss of caste, the first thought is, that the term denotes *false* feeling. But how, or on what grounds? How can feeling be false? How do we distinguish false feeling from the true? Feeling is feeling, one may say; it is a pleasurable or painful motion in our physical or spiritual sensorium, or in both combined; and in this there can be only a difference of intensity. Thus viewed, one feeling is as real as another. Even the pleasurable and painfulness, although it has never been physiologically analysed since Plato made the attempt, must fall somewhere in a similar category. If not a matter of strict quantity, it is some how, one of ratio and relation. And how can there be any thing false in this? As a man think-

eth so is he. In one sense he cannot think what is false ; in a much stronger and clearer sense may it be maintained, perhaps, that he cannot *feel* what is false. To this we answer: the untruthfulness is not in the feeling *per se*; nor may it be in the cause, or spiritual or physical state out of which it arises. The proposition, however, becomes intelligible when it is predicated of the end or aim. Pure feeling, as well as pure reason, is in itself unselfish. Now the feeling of which we treat, becomes false by going out of its own pure bound into another sphere where there is a new and selfish aim. This may not stand out objectively, as matter of consciousness, at least in the beginning of its indulgence, but it will, at length, become as distinct a purpose as ever the miser proposed to himself in the hoarding of his gold, or the ambitious man in the pursuit of fame and power. But to present the truth in a manner less abstract, we may say, that there is a false feeling of pity, compassion, or benevolence, (if this latter name may be at all allowed in such connection) as well as a false appetite for food and drink. Now a false appetite is one that is created and indulged for the sake of the appetite. There are such epicures ; there are men who do this with but little direct consciousness of their governing aim ; there are other men who do it deliberately and with set calculation. Thus also, sentimentalism is a feeling for the sake of the feeling ; it is a feeling of one's feelings—a *feeling to feel*. In other words, the feeling is its own aim, rather than any good of the external object, real or fictitious, which is mainly used as the instrument of its outward birth. It rests in itself as an *end*, instead of being employed, as reason and religion would both employ it, as a *means* to a moral state higher than itself,—as the nurse and aliment of a higher virtue.

Sentimentalism, then, is a feeling to feel. It is not so with benevolence, true benevolence, or charity, or patriotism. These are self-forgetful, so far as they are benevolence or charity, whilst their counterfeit is the most intensely selfish of all spiritual exercises. Benevolence and charity are feelings, but feeling is not their aim. It is

feeling that has an end beyond itself, and is, therefore, not only pure, but vigorous, healthy, and satisfying, just in proportion to its self-forgetfulness. The other state of soul needs an outward object, it is true, but simply as exciting cause. Thus, too, instead of being an *end*, this outward object is unnaturally converted, or rather introverted into a *medium* of sentimental enjoyment, and begins to be actually and consciously desired for that purpose. Misery is desired, misery is sought, misery is ideally created, for the flow of luscious emotion which it excites. Hence, sentimentalism, strictly, is as selfish as the love of ice cream, or the love of oysters, or the appetite for brandy. It rests and riots in the luxury of its own feelings. It seeks their gratification as selfishly, as intensely, as ever the epicure longed for his luscious dish, or the still lower sensualist for the grossest animal pleasure. It claims, at first, a higher rank than these, and seems actually entitled to such higher rank, from its presenting the appearance of a higher parentage; but its bastard birth sinks it to the same essential level, whilst its actual association with these lower things, (which is ever the case when the real battle of truth and principle has to be fought) leaves no doubt of its true character as "earthly, sensual, devilish," even when it wraps itself in the robe of an angel of light. History has more than once shown that a giant cruelty may be the most natural successor of an age remarkable for such a false and epicurian sentimentalism, even as a Robespierre and a Danton may be the natural successors and antitypes of a Jean Jacques Rousseau.

Let us endeavor to make the view still clearer by some familiar illustration. The same scene, we will suppose, presents itself to the worldly man of business, as he is styled, to the truly benevolent man or woman, and to the sketching, picture-drawing, idealising, sentimentalist. It is the little ragged girl that sweeps the crossing. The first manifests not even a sign of recognition. The second bestows his penny and passes on with his mind full of the thought,—how shall the children of this wretched class be

rescued from so degraded and so dangerous a condition. His compassion, when it has performed its true, though lower office, in stirring up the reason to the contemplation of such a problem, forgets itself in the higher object. The *feeling* has been legitimately employed as a *means*, instead of an *end*. It is a pure and gentle, not an intense or consuming flame. He may appear cold; the heart may seem to be absorbed in the head, but the heart is all the sounder for having been content with its prompting duty, and we may even say, too, although it may appear a contradiction and a paradox, has all the more of hearty feeling for not having made that feeling its own selfish end. We have described the two first. The third character takes a different road from both. He or she goes home and writes a tale,—it may be for a Literary Magazine, a Journal of Reform, or a Sunday newspaper. He may have spoken words of compassion; he may have had feelings of compassion; he may have bestowed pecuniary relief; but the sketch, the picture, the emotion, rightly born perhaps, but unnaturally introverted and cherished at the time that it might be the more vividly remembered and recorded afterwards,—these occupy the soul, not as *means*, not as *prompters*, but as the very luxuries of feeling, either actual or fancied, which the scene calls out, and for which, though perhaps unconsciously, it was mainly sought.

He or she goes home, we say, and writes a tale entitled, "The Little Girl who Sweeps the Crossing," or it may be "The Flower Girl in the Ferry Boat," so little heeded by the cold and calculating throng of surrounding passengers; or it may be any other scene perhaps, that will furnish to the male or female sketcher that compound luxury which is made up of the greatest flow of this subjective self-feeding emotion, combined with the greatest amount of railing at the hard-hearted world, or hard hearted formalistic Church that presents itself in such direct contrast with the liquid charity of our melting sentimentalist.

In such a sketch, from such a mind and hand, the hardened man of business would doubtless form one of the

most prominent objects. How strikingly does his uncaring selfishness and worldliness stand opposed to the picture-maker's own feeling heart! How clear, and soft, and glowing, does the latter appear, when viewed against such a background. The man of cold benevolence also comes in for a conspicuous, but more unfavorable place in the moral landscape. He gives an admirable occasion for the usual canting against the heartlessness of political economy, the innate vice of our social institutions, and above all, the deadness and worldliness of the Church. The sketcher is no hypocrite, in the gross sense of the term. He really feels all this. This tenderness of emotion, this intensity of indignation against worldliness and pharisaism, they are all his own, his own nourished creations, children of his own begetting; he is most intensely sincere; but how little does he really know of his own heart! One who reads the spirits aright, might, perhaps, see in the painter himself one of the most odious features that appears in the whole field of view, something that dresses itself in robes of beauty, and yet, to the eye that will see nothing but truth, a more deformed object than the unfeeling wordliness or ecclesiastical deadness of spirit. For certainly the want of all feeling is a better state of soul, a more desirable state of soul for a rational being, than that which would make the woes of humanity the sources of its luxurious emotion, or the unnatural aliment with which it feeds its own sentiment of self-complacency, as compared with the hardness which it loves to fancy as existing in others.

True benevolence, we have said, *is ever self-forgetful*. It thinks not of its own emotion, and the emotion is ever the more sound, and even the more healthfully vigorous, on that very account. Sentimentalism, by making the feeling the end, actually impairs it,—certainly in quality, if not in quantity. It makes it, too, a source of strange pain by converting it into that morbid appetite which ever demands gratification, when it is almost certain to yield only an unceasing irritability, instead of the rest of serene and substantial happiness. It is just as the sensualist ever destroys his

enjoyment, and must destroy his enjoyment, by thinking upon it, and making it an *end*, whilst he who eats as a *means* to health, or even to relieve hunger, has a relish in his food of which the epicure can have no experience. Such pleasure is as suicidal as it is irrational. "He that would lose his life shall find it; he that would find his life shall lose it." It is true of the moral affections, as well as of the great matter of human salvation.

Again—true benevolence is ever humble and humbling. Some might deny the latter effect; but nothing can be more true in itself, nor more in accordance with the view the Scriptures give us of this virtue in its human relations. Alms-giving, in the Bible, is something more than a duty. It is presented to us as a means of grace. The Romish Church, by making it a merit, has changed its character and allied it, in its effect, to the spurious passion of which we are treating; yet, still no one can carefully read the New Testament without recognizing the idea. Alms-giving is not simply a duty; it is for the souls' health, the souls' good. It is a mother of virtue, a nurse of all Christian affections; and this office it performs by keeping the heart lowly as well as tender. Action, instead of feeling, being the aim of true charity, the obligation, the duty, always seems beyond the performance be it ever so hearty; and hence the humbling conviction of unworthiness, of insufficiency, rather than that self-inflation which ever accompanies the indulgence of the epicurean sentimentalism. A mere hint here is sufficient for the reader who has had any experience of what it is to visit the haunts of wretchedness and vice, as a Gospel duty, and with that only motive which the Gospel justifies. If there has been in his soul one spark of true benevolence, he has left them humbled in his own eyes, rather than exalted. There has been a joy, but there has been a pain too, which will prevent that joy taking the false guise, and false tendency, of the worldly and selfish passion. He will have no heart to take notes for sentimental tales; and we may well doubt, whether such productions even, in fact, do come from such a source. He

has had a feeling, a feeling not sought but forced upon him, of the *common* misery, of the common depravity, of the common condemnation, and this catholic view allows of no individual self-elation, while it shuts out all railing against institutions, or the Church, or even the world as something which is an outward oppression, rather than an ex-pression of our fallen human nature. Along with this there must ever come a sense of the inadequacy of his own charity, even in its fullest flow. He feels its poor value in the sight of Infinite Love, and this humbles him to the dust. He would conceal what he has done, not simply as a reluctant performance of duty enjoined upon him by Christian rule, but because the deficiency of his charity is ever the prominent feature in his eyes; its poverty, its inadequacy, are ever before him, especially as measured by that great poverty of our race which revelation *alone* has made him to know and feel. It sends him home in the spirit of the publican, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner, a hard-hearted, self-loving sinner, rather than with the feeling of the Pharisaical sentimentalist, rejoicing in the exuberance of its emotions, and thanking God, or nature, that he is not like other men, the flinty worldling, the calculating economist, the unpitying Church-goer,—reversing, in fact, the very language, as well as spirit, of the Gospel, and indulging the most extatic complacency in the thought that he, or she, is indeed the good Samaritan, and not the Priest and Levite who passed by, each on his own side of the way.

Are we drawing fancy pictures, like the people whose fault we are attempting to expose, or is it a most mischievous reality, working an evil that in the long run, and when its day of over-action and re-action has fully come, will be found to surpass any thing that could be fairly charged, either upon worldliness or pharisaism? Is it not breeding an egotism, a selfishness most blinding, as all selfishness is, and yet intense just in proportion as it cheats itself with the appearance of the most unalloyed philanthropy. Is it not, in fact, the great taint of our modern literature, especially in the department of fictitious writing. There are

men and women of this class who are more truly living on the woes of humanity, than the mercantile or manufacturing avarice which they so sharply denounce as the opposite of their own more tender and heavenly state of soul. They go forth for *scenes*, as the gambler or speculator watches for his prey. They roam the streets for pictures of vice and misery, as the painter seeks for the most eccentric features in natural scenery to make part of his composite landscape. Whatever is not well adapted to this purpose, they avoid or distort; and hence it is that they can never be trusted. They may be as exact as a Flemish painting—as exact as Dickens in Fagin and Bill Sykes—and yet their facts so placed as to make the most monstrous of falsehoods. Some things, too, are their peculiar aversion, and hence they are ever left out of, or caricatured in, their sketches. Tracts, and Sabbath schools, and genuine religious instruction, would not look well in “Hot Corn Stories;” the feeling they create would be alien to the stimulus such fictions most naturally demand; they would be out of harmony, too, with their leading design, and, therefore, all such facts, and all such ideas, are most carefully eschewed. For no other reason, too, than to give the desired light and shade to such an ideal landscape, they blacken some men as devils, and paint other men as angels, that is, angels according to their conception of them, but with a sad variance from the idea the Scriptures give us of the messengers of mercy. Their good men and women are good on no principle of goodness recognized by Christianity, or even in any sound ethical system. Their bad men are bad with an equal absence of all reason for being such, except the fancy of the writer. The Cheerybles overflow with benevolence; but this is either on no ground at all, or on one that is wholly alien to the morality of the Gospel. The writer by taking special pains to mingle a little profanity, now and then, with their charities, unmistakably shows that he meant to exclude any such idea. On the other hand, the Ralph Nickelbies are bad, horribly bad, but then their demoniac depravity is equally groundless, equally irrational. Ethi-

cal systems recognize a difference of culture and education. The Scriptures make a difference of faith, of discipleship, and, above all, of *grace*. Men may dislike the word and the idea. A difference of *grace*! they cannot bear the sound or the thought of it. But surely it is more rational than no ground of difference at all. With this school there is no such rational, to say nothing of any Scriptural ground. In fact, there is no *reason* in it; it is all *feeling*; *good feeling* on the one side, and *bad feeling* on the other. This difference, too, of goodness and badness, as thus presented, is simply another matter of feeling; and some times, oft times, we believe, its very arbitrariness throws the reader on the very opposite side to that to which the writer would seek to draw him. This, we think, must often be the case, not with the perverse or capricious, but the right minded. Poor old Ralph Nickleby!—he asks himself, as he reads along, and gets his sympathy aroused by the way in which the writer has blackened him, so cruelly and groundlessly blackened him,—poor old Ralph Nickleby! why should he be so very bad, and the Cheerybles so very, very good? Why should one be such a vessel of dishonor, so full of all wrath and bitterness, the other such a capacious vat running over with the very treacle of good feeling, such a full discharging pipe of saccharine benevolence, cloying, if not actually disgusting us, by its ever luscious flow? And so again, why should the Uriah Heaps be so very mean, so loathsome, so monstrously, so irrationally depraved, and the David Copperfields such noble and honorable fellows? If we look at this thing carefully, we find that the ground of difference cannot be any depravity of nature, any *φρονιμα σαρχος*, or “fault and corruption that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam.” It cannot be any thing of this kind; for all writers of the school, with hardly an exception, reject it as a most atrocious and man-libelling tenet. It cannot, again, be any difference of circumstances, or of outward culture, much as these writers would seem to insist upon it, and find all their moral in it; so far as they ever pretend to have any moral. It cannot be this

difference of culture, we say; for here we are met by the puzzling enigma which the Dickens and the Thackerays so love to present, that from those in nearest connection with Christian institutions come so often, if not oftenest, the monsters of hypocrisy and malevolence, whilst among thieves and circus-riders, and abandoned foundlings, and street-walking women, are to be found the best specimens of the disguised angel in humanity. And then, again, their conversions are equally without a reason in any consistent view of ethics or theology. The vile become so suddenly transformed, or rather the angel within them is so strangely brought out, no one can tell why nor how, nor for what purpose. There is in it neither moral, nor immoral, unless we regard it as the deepest immorality thus to employ the human life, the human miseries, the most vital, and, we may say, the most sacred of human feelings as the mere paint and pallets for the exhibition of the sentimental daubers' pictorial powers. There is, however, one character they are fond of describing, that has no redeeming trait. It is pure devil without any of the angel at all. Such is the deformed and caricatured religionist. At times there is an attempt to make amends for this by drawing some kind of Goldsmith village curate, or Vicar of Wakefield parson; but, in general, and especially may we say it of the writings of Dickens and his imitators, the religious teacher, or he who assumes to be such, is pure, unmixed, and irredeemable depravity. He never reforms. There is no angel in him; and we say, too, there is no reason in him, no reason whatever for his being what the sketcher represents him. He is such a hypocrite!—such a foolish hypocrite, too. He cants so, in season and out of season; his disguise is so thin, and he loves so to exhibit its most bare and tattered parts, as though he had put on this loathsome robe of cant and devilism for the very purpose of exposing, rather than concealing, his deformity.

The whole proceeding is arbitrary and capricious, sometimes so utterly arbitrary, that it shocks that innate sense of justice which we cannot help carrying into the ideal as

well as the real world. Our remark is justified by an appeal to consciousness. Many may be led away by these pictures, but readers of another class, and the better class, we think, have their sense of moral and intellectual justice so hurt by this reasonless proceeding, that they can hardly keep out a decided feeling of partiality for the bad characters; the writer has made them so very bad, so uselessly and unreasonably wicked. He has so blackened them, so unnecessarily and unjustly blackened them in comparison with others who have no more reason in their goodness, that one feels momentarily a disposition to take their side. We can hardly help sympathising with the Ralph Nicklebies and the same perverseness, if any choose to call it such, makes us satiated and disgusted with that discharge of *good nature*, without either grace or principle of any kind, that is ever running over from the sentimental Cheerybles. We cannot like these good men and women, whilst we are indignant at the injustice done the hypocrite, and begin to feel even a partiality for the wronged and blackened villain. We would rather see him triumph in his villainy, than that such bastard virtue, such unscriptural goodness, should carry off that false and demoralizing triumph which writers of this school are so fond of painting. There is no reason in the goodness, or if there is any appearance of reason or design, it is in the fact that whatever ground such *good feeling* may have, it is certainly something different from that sure foundation for all truthful virtue that is laid in the Christian revelation.

It is in this way we may account for the moral effect of the sentimental tendency upon the picture-makers themselves. Whilst true benevolence—*well-willing* (*bene volo*) that aims at *well-being* rather than mere *well-feeling*—true Gospel benevolence, doing good to man for Christ's sake in recognition of the common fall, and the common redemption,—whilst such benevolence is humbling, softening, making the heart more tender, more full of melting emotion, too, in proportion as that emotion is not the aim of its fancy or its exercise,—while such benevolence clears the

moral perceptions leading continually to a deeper self-knowledge, in a word heals and strengthens the whole moral state,—sentimentalism, on the other hand, is heart-hardening; it is destructive, not only of the purity, but of the soundness and life of the very *feeling* it would affect to cherish. The men and women who indulge it most, will not bear a close examination into their private, or we might rather say, less public life; for, strictly speaking, they have no private, meditative, self-searching, and soul-searching existence. Their real character becomes in time, manifest even to the superficial world. When they have exhausted the dregs of sentimentalism, and the cloyed appetite has eaten out all its sensual sweet, then, in their spiritual bankruptcy, they turn misanthropes, and end their railing at the Church (the cold, unidealising, unsentimental Protestant Church) by going off to Romanism, and making the finale of their subjectivity in the most abject submission to the most despotic outward authority. Such writers and thinkers may seem to some the farthest removed from Rome, but they are all on the road that terminates there, and the wily Jesuit, much as he may appear to condemn this kind of literature, as the growth of “ultra Protestantism,” has good reason to rejoice in it, and does rejoice in it, and sometimes tries his hand at it, as preparing the soil for a rich harvest of thick coming converts when the fruit shall be fully ripe. Some have already arrived at this goal, and would go farther if their backs were not now to the wall. Protestant benevolence is too homely for them; it is too much like the simple way of doing good, recommended and practised in the New Testament; the Sister of Charity has more of the ideal, the sentimental, than the tract distributor, or the unpretending male or female ward-visitant; the charities of the convent, or of the religious order, have more romance, more poetry in them, they are more nearly allied to certain kinds of fiction; they have, in short, more of the luxury, of the sensuality, we may say, of false and sickly emotion.

There can be no greater fallacy than that which leads

well as the real world. Our remark is justified by an appeal to consciousness. Many may be led away by these pictures, but readers of another class, and the better class, we think, have their sense of moral and intellectual justice so hurt by this reasonless proceeding, that they can hardly keep out a decided feeling of partiality for the bad characters; the writer has made them so very bad, so uselessly and unreasonably wicked. He has so blackened them, so unnecessarily and unjustly blackened them in comparison with others who have no more reason in their goodness, that one feels momentarily a disposition to take their side. We can hardly help sympathising with the Ralph Nicklebies and the same perverseness, if any choose to call it such, makes us satiated and disgusted with that discharge of *good nature*, without either grace or principle of any kind, that is ever running over from the sentimental Cheerybles. We cannot like these good men and women, whilst we are indignant at the injustice done the hypocrite, and begin to feel even a partiality for the wronged and blackened villain. We would rather see him triumph in his villany, than that such bastard virtue, such unscriptural goodness, should carry off that false and demoralizing triumph which writers of this school are so fond of painting. There is no reason in the goodness, or if there is any appearance of reason or design, it is in the fact that whatever ground such *good feeling* may have, it is certainly something different from that sure foundation for all truthful virtue that is laid in the Christian revelation.

It is in this way we may account for the moral effect of the sentimental tendency upon the picture-makers themselves. Whilst true benevolence—*well-willing* (*bene volo*) that aims at *well-being* rather than mere *well-feeling*—true Gospel benevolence, doing good to man for Christ's sake in recognition of the common fall, and the common redemption,—whilst such benevolence is humbling, softening, making the heart more tender, more full of melting emotion, too, in proportion as that emotion is not the aim of its fancy or its exercise,—while such benevolence clears the

moral perceptions leading continually to a deeper self-knowledge, in a word heals and strengthens the whole moral state,—sentimentalism, on the other hand, is heart-hardening; it is destructive, not only of the purity, but of the soundness and life of the very *feeling* it would affect to cherish. The men and women who indulge it most, will not bear a close examination into their private, or we might rather say, less public life; for, strictly speaking, they have no private, meditative, self-searching, and soul-searching existence. Their real character becomes in time, manifest even to the superficial world. When they have exhausted the dregs of sentimentalism, and the cloyed appetite has eaten out all its sensual sweet, then, in their spiritual bankruptcy, they turn misanthropes, and end their railing at the Church (the cold, unidealising, un-sentimental Protestant Church) by going off to Romanism, and making the finale of their subjectivity in the most abject submission to the most despotic outward authority. Such writers and thinkers may seem to some the farthest removed from Rome, but they are all on the road that terminates there, and the wily Jesuit, much as he may appear to condemn this kind of literature, as the growth of “ultra Protestantism,” has good reason to rejoice in it, and does rejoice in it, and sometimes tries his hand at it, as preparing the soil for a rich harvest of thick coming converts when the fruit shall be fully ripe. Some have already arrived at this goal, and would go farther if their backs were not now to the wall. Protestant benevolence is too homely for them; it is too much like the simple way of doing good, recommended and practised in the New Testament; the Sister of Charity has more of the ideal, the sentimental, than the tract distributor, or the unpretending male or female ward-visitant; the charities of the convent, or of the religious order, have more romance, more poetry in them, they are more nearly allied to certain kinds of fiction; they have, in short, more of the luxury, of the sensuality, we may say, of false and sickly emotion.

There can be no greater fallacy than that which leads

men, and especially young men, to judge this class of authors—their moral characters we mean—by their published writings, or to fancy that because a man, or a woman, can draw a moving picture of vice and misery, can cry out against Scribes and Pharisees, can paint clergymen as hypocrites, and circus-riders as possessed of all sentimental virtues, can talk boldly and constantly of reform, and lament pathetically over the miseries that flow out of the false institutions of society—that, therefore, they must certainly be, in themselves, either virtuous or *feeling*. Even the latter quality of soul, morally characterless as it is in itself, may be only an occasional and artificially stimulated excitement, got up for a special purpose, and relapsing into utter heartlessness when the demands of that occasion have been satisfied. A little reflection might surely convince us, that there may be, after all, no more of the moral excellence in this, than in the luxury of the theatre, or to come somewhat lower, the enjoyments of the refectory, the melting jellies, or the glass of intoxicating champagne. A man may write for years in that style, and yet be himself a heartless wretch, growing more and more heartless the more he writes, showing himself, on close acquaintance, more and more destitute even of the poor virtue he is so fond of painting. He is not even a man of feeling; he may be as far even from this, as the poor inebriate from that religion about which he is so fond of babbling in his cups. Not that the man is a hypocrite, in the gross sense of the word. If he does not employ the artificial sentiment, which he can call out at pleasure, for some still more sordid end, still may it be said of him, to use a homely, yet significant mode of expression, he takes it out in feeling, such as it is; and when he has done this long and often, there is nothing higher and better left of him. He takes it out in sentiment, even as he so exhausts his virtue in the ideal painting as to have no room, and no stimulus for actual benevolence. He takes it out in feeling, and hence we get the explanation of the seeming paradox, that not only the Christian virtue, but the true, actual, living feeling of such a wasted

heart may be in the inverse ratio of its sentimental profusion.

This life of emotional stimulus, this *intemperance* of feeling for feeling's sake, may be, and we think it often is, even more heart-hardening than money-making, or any kindred form of worldliness. We have more faith in the benevolence of a Rothschild than in that of a Dickens. It may seem to some an outrageous paradox, but we can offer reasons for what we say, cogent, conclusive reasons, even if experience of mankind did not preclude the necessity of any *a priori* proof. Business, money-making, worldliness, call it what we will, does not deal with such sacred things, and, therefore, runs less risk of moral hurt. The feelings, what there is of them, are carried *out* to outward ends, instead of ever turning introvertedly on themselves, like Milton's children of sin ever gnawing into the maternal vitality. They kill themselves, when they thus become, at the same time, both subject and object. No moral, or religious life can stand such a process. But this is not the danger of the worldling, as we call him. Whilst his thoughts are wholly on money, or secular prosperity, his moral affections may, indeed, be locked up in blank inertia, where they may grow chill and torpid. Still there may be life in them yet. There is a possibility of their recovering. There may come the good occasion, and the good influence under which they may gush out afresh,—gush out, it may be, even the more powerfully from their long seclusion. Such a man may have feeling still in reserve; but the sentimentalist has worn it out. He has destroyed his moral affections, not so much by *use* as by *misuse*. He has employed his feelings for their own sake, and hence the waste has been without that recuperative power, that healing, yea new-life-giving corrective, which the exercise of true Bible-taught benevolence ever brings along with it. He has misused the most sacred things belonging to the human spiritual constitution, and the peril is in proportion to the profanity. He has not simply benumbed, but fatally injured, perhaps destroyed them. Or what is still worse,

he may have converted their delicate machinery into the most deadly combination of unholy moral forces. If such misuse of the moral affections does not terminate in apathetic indifference, there may come from it, in the end, something which we will not call worse, though more evil in its effects. It is a higher, yet a more unholy thing. It is fanaticism, that horrid unnatural monster, child of wrath and perverted sentiment, assuming the form of love and heaven-born charity.

And so too of what are called the religious states, whether of mind or heart. Some may be shocked at the assertion, but we say it boldly, and with full confidence in its truth,—Antinomianism is not so mischievous, or dangerous a thing as mysticism, or to speak more carefully, certain forms of mysticism; formalism has not so much peril for the soul as religious sentimentalism, or that false religious feeling that makes itself its own end and object.

With the minds that are imbued with this *faith*, and *dogmas* are not favorite words; but if we must have a speculation, it had better be one about faith than love. There may be a rationalistic theorising about both, in fact a science of both. If any man doubts it, let him read Swedenborg and other mystics, until the best affections of his nature, to say nothing of grace, become as dry as scholasticism, and as unemotional as the mathematics. The dogmatic speculation *indurates*, the other *withers* and destroys. The petrification may, perhaps, be melted, but the lost heart cannot be restored. *Faith* may be talked about, and reasoned about; it may be analyzed, and syllogized, and dogmatized, very much to its injury, perhaps; but *love* is too refined, too celestial, too holy, to bear such treatment at all. And hence, we would say, that no philosophy is more heartless than what some would style, and have styled, "the Philosophy of the Heart," no *gnosis* is so lean, so dries up the soul's best affections, and is, at the same time, so uncharitable, as the mystics' *gnosis* of charity. Other knowledge "puffeth up," but this is a spiritual evaporation, a gaseous inanity, as destitute of all true warmth, as it is utterly barren of distinct and living ideas.

If in other departments sentimentalism is odious and mischievous, in religion it is abominable. Better, far better, for a man to have his spiritual state like the desert, like "the dry and thirsty land wherein no water is," than to cherish any false feeling, or any of those artificial emotions in which the poor self-cheating human soul would seek to dress itself for the Divine Eye, or to disguise from itself its own spiritual barrenness. If a man has any moral ability, it is the ability to be honest, spiritually honest,—that is, to be, or strive to be, nothing but what he really is. If there can be any such thing as human merit in the Divine eyes, it would be found that simplicity or transparency of spirit, that perfect honesty which prefers to be totally destitute of all feeling, yea, harder than the nether mill-stone, rather than present before Omniscience any feeling that is not perfectly truthful, that is not a perfect representative of its moral state, be that moral state ever so defective, ever so hardened, or ever so depraved.

It is from this morbid religious sentimentalism has sprung that most baneful of all the species of modern literature. We mean what is commonly called the religious novel. Of this there are two general kinds, although they are often mingled in one and the same production. The controversial species is away from our present notice, except to remark, that it is the poorest, the meanest, the least logical, and in general, the least convincing mode ever adopted for carrying on an argument,—especially a very grave argument. The sentimental religious novel, is, therefore, the one we chiefly have in view. Now here it may be said, that other kinds of sentimentalism do mischief by marring, and presenting a false picture, or a misplaced picture, of the most vital affections of our human nature. Still these are strictly human. They belong to the human constitution as it is by nature, or as it has been the subject of natural or mere human culture. But the religious sentimentalism lays its profane and trifling hand on far higher and holier things. We believe, of course, as one of the first elements of Christian doctrine, that true Christian character

can only come from a super-human causation, whether that be regarded as an influence, or an immediate action of supernatural power, or a real indwelling of a supernatural life. It is, in any way, the offspring of a divine formative or creative agent, whose name is only to be mentioned with a reverence that veils its face, or holds it prostrate in the dust; and yet it is the work of this agent, his most spiritual, most holy work, which the religious sentimentalist, or the author of religious fictions, attempts to imitate. He would transfer it to his soiled canvass; he would paint it with his miserable colors, foul, distorted and unscriptural as they so often are. Here is the awful profanity of the attempt. "Hot Corn Stories" are bad enough, but they do mischief on a much lower scale. False as they are, they yet profess to be delineations of the human. It is bad, we say, to trifle even here. But when a man, or a woman, would undertake to paint the work of grace, and would draw a picture of the ineffable mystery of regeneration, who can adequately set forth the impiety or the mischief? What other breach of the second commandment can exceed it in bold irreverence? We shrink from the audacity of some of the old painters, who dared to make a pictorial representation of the Divine Personal Majesty, but we cannot help thinking, that, in some respects, at least, its profanity falls below such attempts to imitate, if not sometimes to caricature, the process of his most mysterious agency in the human soul.

This sentimental, egotistical, or subjective style we have contemplated chiefly as it appears in works of avowed fiction. But there are other departments in which it shows itself. In fact it is tainting a very large part of our modern literature. It affects injuriously our poetry, making it the introverted burden of false feeling, instead of the unselfish expression of unselfish emotion that seeks this channel because it cannot find free vent in any other way. In the true poet no trait is more charming than his utter self-forgetfulness; in the diseased or introverted species, nothing is more wearisome, unless it be to a sentimentally depraved

taste, than the manner in which the author makes *himself*, his feelings, his *lofty* ideas or lofty views, his inexpressible emotions, the foreground, and background, and central coloring of every picture. The same vice appears largely in our books of travels. It is creating towards them, and justly creating, a suspicion of insincerity. It is taking away that *trust* we love to repose in works of this class, and which not only constitutes their chief claim, but is so essential to their permanent literary character. We wish the traveller, if he writes, to give us facts, to fill his books with facts, to present to us accurate descriptions, and in this to be as vivid, and even as pictorial, as he pleases. But we do not want him to be ever telling us how he *feels*, and how his guide *feels*, and even how his horse or camel *feels*. Some fill their books with this, as though the obtaining of materials for such trashy subjective picturing of their own inner man, was the only motive that ever sent them abroad. They have travelled, not to see the earth and its physical and human wonders, but that they may come home and make a book. We wish for facts, we say again, both from the traveller and the historian. We would rather have our own *subjective*, our own emotional, not forced upon us as the emotions of the writer, but arising spontaneously from the facts he honestly sets before us. A Robinson may be pronounced dry, and he *is* dry at first, but as we read on, this truthfulness is found to have its charm; the picture of the Holy Land rises vividly before us; our own feelings spring up and grow vigorously from this rich and well prepared foundation of facts; and thus there is, in the end, more of true, hearty, and permanent emotion, than ever came from the story-telling volumes of a Buckingham, or all the books with which the press is now teeming from a similar class of modern tourists. Robinson's Researches, with their measurements and statistics, will be remembered, will stand on the shelves of libraries, will be consulted as authority, and referred to as settled things in history and geography, when the others shall be unread and utterly forgotten. But this opens a wider field than can here be occupied.

The hints already given may, however, enable the thoughtful reader to make a much more extensive application, and to other subjects than those that have been brought directly before his notice.

Schnectady, New York.

T. L.

ART. III.—HODGE ON THE EPHESIANS.

A COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS. By *Charles Hodge*, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1856.

THE distinguished character and high position of the author of this work, taken in connection with the wide significance of its subject, must be allowed on all hands to clothe it with more than ordinary claims to attention. The Epistle to the Ephesians is of cardinal authority, in particular for the doctrine of the Church; and it forms in such view the key, we may say, for the right understanding of all St. Paul's Epistles generally, which must serve of course also at the same time, to open the true sense of all the other Epistles of the New Testament. Knowing this, we could not be indifferent to the view that might be taken of it by such a man as Dr. Hodge. His theory of the Church, as it has been presented to the world in various ways, is commonly understood to be very low; so low indeed, that it has given serious dissatisfaction to many in his own communion. It has been a matter of interest with us to see, how such a theory would be applied in his hands to the interpretation

of the Epistle to the Ephesians. We have, accordingly, examined the new commentary with respectful consideration and care; and having done so, we propose now to make it the occasion for some earnest criticism and discussion, in our present article.

Our object is not to go into exegetical details; to speak of particular excellencies belonging to the work, or of what we may suppose to be its particular errors and defects. Our concern rather is with the work, viewed as a whole; with its general theological stand-point; with its reigning idea of the Gospel; with the scheme of Christianity which underlies all its thinking, and so gives form and determination to its particular expositions from beginning to end. We feel that there is an advantage in this. It leaves free room for all proper acknowledgment of the merits of the commentary, in its own order and system of thought. Indeed if we did not honor it in such view as the fruit of real learning and piety, we should hardly feel it necessary to notice it in the way of controversy at all. As it is, we contend with it because we hold it in respect. It represents ably the system of theological opinion in whose bosom it stands; and by doing so, challenges attention to its peculiar pretensions and claims, while it furnishes a fair opportunity also for bringing them into trial. For our readers generally also, we take it for granted, the general criticism we propose is likely to be of more interest than any discussion of single and separate points of exegesis. Such points it may indeed fall in our way occasionally to take in hand; but when that is the case, it will not be so much on their own particular account, as for the sake of their bearing on what is more comprehensive and broad. Our consideration of single passages and texts, will be steadily subordinated to the wider purpose of explaining, exemplifying, exposing and overthrowing, so far as with God's help we may be able, the general theological theory, which we find employed, with so much learning and ability, in the commentary before us, to darken, as it seems to us, the true sense of this most interesting and important portion of God's Word.

In any case, the theological scheme with which an interpreter comes to the exposition of the Bible, is more deserving of consideration than any isolated results of his exegetical learning aside from this. Our theology, or want of theology, must always rule our exegesis. The notion of a purely grammatical exegesis, as urged by the school of Ernesti, is simply absurd. No amount of philological or historical learning can of itself lead to a trustworthy exposition of what the Scriptures actually say and teach. The case requires, in addition to this, an inward correspondence and sympathy of mind on the part of the expositor, with the world of truth which he is called to expound. It needs the living spirit of any science or art, to read aright the true sense of its utterances and speak forth the hidden power of its creations. And just so, it requires the inward stand-point of a positively right and sound theology, to understand and explain to full purpose the theological teachings of the Bible. It may sound well, to talk of coming to the Scriptures without any theory or scheme; but there is not in fact, and cannot be, any such freedom from all prepossession. The Bible supposes the existence of Christianity as a fact already at hand, and utters all its oracles from the bosom of this new creation alone. We must come to it then with the prepossession of faith, or else with the prepossession of unbelief, the worst possible preparation for understanding it, on the supposition of its being more than an empty fable. Of what account here can the greatest knowledge of words be, without any actual sense of the things with which the words are concerned? An infidel pretending to explain the Bible, is like a man born blind discoursing of colors. All mere rationalism or naturalism must necessarily travesty its sense. But for the very same reason that faith in general, or power to acknowledge the supernatural character of Christianity, as distinguished from full unbelief, forms thus the necessary habit of a good interpreter of the sacred text, it is plain that it must be of vast account also for such an interpreter to possess this habit of faith in a form approaching as nearly as possible to the

very nature of the things themselves with which it is employed. And therefore it is always of the first consequence, as we have already remarked, to look to the theological scheme which an interpreter brings with him to the exposition of the Bible and from which as a stand-point he takes his observations upon its sense.

It is hardly necessary to say, that this Commentary of Dr. Hodge is constructed upon a general theory of the nature of Christianity, thus previously established and fixed in his own mind. If it were not so, the work would be entitled to but small regard. We find no fault with it merely on this ground. Only let the fact be fairly understood and kept in sight; that we may make due account of it, in examining the work itself. It is not an attempt to explain the Epistle to the Ephesians purely and exclusively from its own text, and without any sort of theological preconception or bias. It can hardly be said, indeed, to pretend to such independence. However it may suit the view of some to make light of all authority in this form, and to look upon tradition of every kind as an embarrassment to the right use of the Scriptures more than a help, we meet with no such pedantry in Dr. Hodge. He has his theological system, his ecclesiastical tradition, that serves him continually as a medium through which to study the features and proportions of the inspired text. Neither is it difficult at all to determine the character of this system. It is well defined, openly acknowledged, and for the most part, though not always, consistently maintained. We may see at once, in such circumstances, how necessary it is that we should try the merits of the system, in order to estimate aright the merits of the Commentary.

No one can have read the Epistles of the New Testament with any sort of attention, without being made sensible in his own mind of a certain difficulty in them, standing not so much in particular passages as in the whole hypothesis which is made to underlie their construction. Two seemingly opposite views are embraced in this, which it is found

exceedingly hard to reconcile or hold in steady union. Let us endeavor to exemplify and explain.

Nothing can be more clear, in the first place, than that these Epistles are not addressed to the world at large in its natural character and state. For the world in such view, the Gospel universally has but one form of address. It calls on all men everywhere to "repent and believe," to submit themselves to Christ, to be "converted," to be "baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," as the absolutely indispensable condition of holiness and salvation. "He that believeth and is baptized," the proclamation runs, "shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." All depends on this obedience of faith. All begins here. Without this preliminary act of submission to Christ's authority, the opportunities and possibilities of grace in any farther view are not regarded as being at hand for the use of men at all. The Gospel never offers its grace for the purposes of sanctification, to those who refuse to place themselves by such preliminary obedience within the range and scope of its supernatural provisions; and it never allows itself, therefore, to waste upon such its lessons of piety or its motives to a holy life. So with these New Testament Epistles. They are full of doctrine, instruction in righteousness, warnings, admonitions, promises, encouragements to Christian duty; but all this for a certain class of persons only, and not for the race of mankind indiscriminately. This is at once evident from their inscriptions and salutations. They are addressed not to countries or towns as such, but to particular bodies of people in them separated and distinguished in some way from the world in general. St. Jude writes "to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called." St. Peter, in one place, "to them that have obtained like precious faith with us, through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;" in another, to dispersed strangers of Pontus, Galatia, &c., who are regarded, at the same time, as gathered together and elect "according to the foreknowledge of God the Father,

through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." So in every Epistle of St. Paul. One is: "To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints;" another: "Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints;" a third: "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia;" a fourth: "Unto the churches of Galatia;" a fifth: "To the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus;" and in similar style throughout. And the restriction thus made in the first address, is always carefully observed in every Epistle on to the end. The writers do not allow themselves to fall away from the conception with which they start, by gliding into any more loose and general view. They have before their mind always, not men at large, but the particular class or description of persons to whom they address themselves in the beginning. Their instructions and exhortations are everywhere for the "church," for the "called," for those who are known as the "faithful in Christ Jesus."

Nothing, moreover, can be more plain, than that the distinction thus kept in view always by these sacred writers was considered by them to be far more than one of name only and mere outward profession. Nominal and outward indeed it is assumed to be, as implying an external separation of some sort from the rest of the world, which might be known and spoken of in such view as a really existing society, bearing its own name and having its own terms of fellowship and communion. The society of the "faithful in Christ Jesus" is referred to, not as a fellowship of opinion only, not as the presence merely of a common sentiment in a number of minds, but as being in some way actually at hand, and open to observation, in the form of an externalized historical fact. But in this character again, as we now say, it is never represented as a simply factitious distinction, turning upon the fancy and pleasure of those who had come to set themselves apart in such style from the surrounding world. It is continually

taken for granted, on the contrary, that it carried along with it benefits and privileges, opportunities and powers, of the very highest order. So much is suggested at once by the titles and terms of address, which are employed, as we have just seen, to characterize those to whom the Epistles are directed. These are quite too bold and strong, to be resolved into the notion of rhetorical declamation simply or gracious compliment. "Beloved of God" (Rom. 1: 7), "called to be saints" (Rom. 1: 7. 1 Cor. 1: 2), "the called of Jesus Christ" (Rom. 1: 6), "those that are sanctified in Christ Jesus" (1 Cor. 1: 2), "saints in Christ" (Eph. 1: 1, Philip. 1: 1, &c.); how unreasonable to imagine for a moment that terms of this description might be used, under the guidance of inspiration, without any meaning answerable to their high sound. We are not left here, however, to such inferences only, as it might seem natural to draw from any titles of this sort taken by themselves. The Epistles in question proceed throughout on the supposition, that the persons whom they address are really and truly in a state or condition corresponding with these titles; and references are made in them continually to what are conceived to be the actual privileges of this state, in such a way as to show that there is not considered to be any exaggeration whatever in the terms thus used for its description.

Take, for example, the First Epistle of St. Peter. No sooner has the Apostle saluted those whom he addresses, than he is led to break out in the language of adoring worship and praise, on account of what appears to him the unspeakable mercy of God bestowed upon them through the Gospel. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead; to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away; reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time." It is not the salvation of the Gospel as a general boon to the

world, not the mere fact at large that Christ has risen from the dead and made salvation possible, that is here made the subject of such joyful praise. It is plainly the special relation rather, in which those addressed are regarded as standing to this grace by virtue of their Christian profession and position. We may congratulate all men, that life and immortality have been brought to light, that redemption is placed within the reach of our guilty and lost race; but in the case before us, the congratulation extends a great deal farther than this. The persons to whom it is offered, are considered to be already, in a most material sense, the recipients and subjects of God's redeeming mercy. They have come actually within the range of its action. They have a present interest in it, and a right to its opportunities and privileges, going vastly beyond any form it may be supposed to carry along with it for the world at large. This very fact, accordingly, is made the ground of all that follows in the way of exhortation to Christian duty. "Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind," it is said, "be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ: as obedient children, not fashioning yourselves according to the former lusts in your ignorance; but as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation." No such exhortation is dreamed of as suitable for men in other circumstances, however desirable it might be that they too should practice the virtues of Christianity; it proceeds throughout on the supposition, that a certain position in the way of grace has been already secured, that an actual foothold in the kingdom of God has been already gained, by which a life of true holiness is rendered practicable, and without which it must ever be vain to bestow either precept or exhortation on the subject. So again: "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light. Which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God; which had not obtain-

ed mercy, but now have obtained mercy. Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul; &c." The order of thought still is: Ye are the subjects of a glorious distinction in the way of grace; ye have passed out of darkness into God's marvellous light; ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth; ye have come out of the world into the Church: *therefore* follow diligently after holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord. Your privilege involves, not merely the duty, but also the power of overcoming the world and entering into everlasting life. See then that it be used with earnestness, and perseverance to the end, for this purpose. The same idea pervades the entire Epistle; as any one may readily see who will take pains to read it with proper attention, bearing in mind the restriction which characterizes its address in the beginning, and observing how all along in conformity with this it is written, not for men at large, but only for those who have come into the bosom of the Church.

St. Paul's Epistles all, in like manner, only if possible in a still more striking way, take for granted everywhere the existence of a most real distinction between those whom they address as saints and the world in its general and natural character. Let any one consider in this view particularly the Epistle to the Ephesians. No terms seem to be too strong for the Apostle, no conceptions too high, in setting forth the condition of grace and privilege to which he considers those advanced, whom he addresses as "the saints which are at Ephesus and the faithful in Christ Jesus." They are already, by their position and calling, "blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ;" the subjects, along with other saints, of a heavenly election and adoption; made accepted in the Beloved, in whom they had "redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." In virtue of their faith, they are said to have been "sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise," which is the earnest of the inheritance that awaits the Christian in the world to

come. They needed a special illumination, only to be able themselves to form any proper conception of the high and glorious significance of their own position; and the most earnest prayer of the Apostle in their behalf, accordingly, was that God might give unto them the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Christ; the eyes of their understanding being enlightened, that they might know what was "the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and what the exceeding greatness of his power" towards them that believe. Their relation to Christ is represented as being nothing less than a present actual comprehension in the new order of life, which was exhibited in his resurrection from the dead, and in his glorification at the right hand of God. They were quickened and raised up together with him, and made to sit with him in heavenly places. They were "no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." They were "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets. Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." Such is the strain in which the Apostle speaks throughout of the high condition and state of those to whom he writes; and all his instructions and practical exhortations, addressed to them as Christians, are so formed as to involve continually the same view. Their spiritual exaltation as the elect of God, the called of Christ, the sealed of the Spirit, the heirs of the heavenly inheritance, is assumed everywhere as an admitted postulate, on the ground of which they are urged upon to cultivate piety and avoid sin. In view of this precisely, they are besought to "walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they are called." Their privileges are made the great reason for their "putting off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts," so as to be "renewed in the spirit of their mind," and to "put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." What is particularly worthy of observation, moreover, is, that the consideration thus pressed is brought forward, not

simply as a motive to recommend and enforce Christian virtue, but as being itself the whole ground of its possibility. The order of thought is in part certainly: Ye are exalted in Christ, and it is, therefore, fit and right for you to cultivate corresponding dispositions and habits. But mainly it goes far beyond this, and means: Ye are highly exalted in Christ, and it is, therefore, practicable for you to cultivate successfully a corresponding character. It is not so much the idea of what *ought* to be, as the idea of what *may* be and *can* be, in virtue of the Christian position, that is urged as the grand argument for a Christian life. "Ye were sometime darkness," it is said, "but now are ye light in the Lord; walk as children of light: for the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness, and righteousness, and truth."

All this, we say, forms one general aspect, under which the conception of Christianity is continually presented to us in the New Testament Epistles. Along with this, however, in the second place, there runs throughout another view, which seems at first to look in quite a different direction, and to place the whole subject in a new and different light. It may be denominated, with propriety perhaps, the human side of the case, as distinguished from its divine side.

We are confronted with it at once in all those representations, which require us to descend from the idea of the lofty privileges of believers, to the thought of the manifold infirmities with which they are still compassed about in their present state. Who has not experienced at times some sense of incongruity, in passing directly from the wonderful terms in which these privileges are described by St. Peter or St. Paul, to the topics of ordinary morality they are made to enforce? It sounds strangely, to hear those who are spoken of as sitting in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, exhorted, at the same time, to avoid the most common sins, such as lying and stealing, and warned against "fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness" among the heathen, including things done by them in secret, of

which it was a "shame even to speak." It sounds strangely, when the power of the Spirit and the power of the flesh, the life of grace and the life of nature, are brought before us in such close proximity as we find ascribed to them in the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians. "Walk in the Spirit," it is there said, "and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. But if ye be led by the Spirit, ye are not under the law. Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, &c." The occasion for admiration here is, not that such sins are condemned as contrary to Christianity, but that those who are addressed should be supposed to be at all liable to the power of them in the immediate and near way that seems to be implied by such a style of exhortation. But the case becomes, in this view, still worse, when we find that the bad possibilities of the Christian state, as thus described, are represented as frequently passing into actual effect. We need not go beyond the New Testament, to get clear of the idea that the early churches were, in a great measure, free from corruption and sin. We have abundant evidence of the contrary in the New Testament itself. The sacred writers use no sort of reserve on the subject. They not only warn Christians against the danger of sin, but bewail and denounce it at times as really present under very gross forms in their communion. We hear of some in the church who denied the Lord that bought them, privily introducing damnable heresies, and bringing upon themselves swift destruction; of certain men, who "turned the grace of God into lasciviousness," walking after their own ungodly lusts; and strange indeed are the terms in which they are spoken of by St. Peter, bringing into immediate juxtaposition, as they do, the exaltation of their Christian state on the one hand, and their enormous abuse of it, to the purposes of sin, on the other. "Spots they are and blemishes, sport-

ing themselves with their own deceivings while they feast with you. Having eyes full of adultery, and that cannot cease from sin ; beguiling unstable souls ; an heart they have exercised with covetous practices ; cursed children. Which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam the son of Bosor, who loved the ways of unrighteousness." "When they speak great swelling words of vanity, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, through much wantonness, *those that were clean escaped from them who live in error.* While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption : for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage. For if *after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,* they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning." Compare with this Heb. 6 : 4-6, and 10 : 26-29, where we have the same startling picture of extremes thrown together, in a way which many have found it exceedingly difficult to understand. The difficulty, however, is not confined to passages of this sort, in which the bright and dark sides of the Christian profession are opposed to each other in such direct and vivid contrast. It meets us with full force, likewise, in all those numerous cases, in which reference is made to ruinous errors or gross corruptions in the Church, without any particular stress being laid at the time on the idea of its abused grace. References of this sort abound on all sides. We meet with them in every Epistle. Lofty as the terms are in which St. Paul addresses the several churches to which he wrote, while his eye is fixed on the thought of their high and glorious privileges, he finds it quite as easy again apparently to admit the existence among them of offences and scandals, which seem to turn the other conception into a mere flourish of empty words. We need not cite examples. They will come up readily of themselves to the mind of every one, who is at all familiar with his writings.

Here then is a peculiar and difficult problem to be solv-

ed, in the interpretation of these Epistles. How are we to bring together the two sides that enter thus into their general hypothesis of Christianity, seemingly incongruous as they are, in such a way that we shall have a result doing full justice to both, and uniting them in real logical harmony for our thoughts? It is plain, that no scheme of exegesis which fails to do this, however much it may have to recommend it on other grounds, can be entitled to confidence; since it must be constructed on a view of the Gospel different from that which pervades the Epistles themselves, and can never serve, therefore, as a sufficient key to unlock their sense.

Now there are two general ways in which a theory of interpretation may wrong the New Testament conception of Christianity, as we have just had it under consideration. It may not do justice to the first side of the hypothesis, or it may not do justice to the second. In the one case, we shall have the idea of nature overwhelmed in a certain sense by a false sublimation of the idea of grace; in the other case, the order will be reversed, and we shall have the idea of grace merged and lost in the idea of nature. For the sake of distinction, we may call one the Calvinistic and the other the Arminian tendency.

The Arminian view proceeds on the supposition, that there is no essential difference between the order of nature and the order of grace. It acknowledges, of course, the existence of grace, regarded as a supernatural power exerted upon the minds of men; but this is not felt to depend on any other order or constitution than that of the world under a simply natural view, considered in the general relation which it sustains to God. Man in his natural character is possessed of intellectual and spiritual faculties, which carry his thoughts above and beyond the present world, and qualify him for entering into communication with the realities of a higher life in the way of religion; and the idea here is, that in order to do so, he needs no other help than what is comprehended in the notion of a common divine influence exercised upon his powers for

this purpose. The whole conception of grace thus resolves itself into this, that God by his Spirit, is supposed to act on the minds of men, just as they are, directly and indirectly, without any intervention whatever; and it is supposed also to depend upon themselves, in the use of their natural ability, whether such gracious influence shall be of avail or not for the purposes of salvation. Such a view, of course, leaves no room for the idea of the Church, as a real economy or constitution different from the world. It is easy to see, accordingly, how it must work, when brought to bear exegetically on the New Testament problem which we have at present under consideration. This Arminian tendency has no power to make any earnest account of the lofty terms, in which St. Peter and St. Paul allow themselves to speak of the privileges of the Christian state, regarded as anything more than the inward condition in general of the truly pious. It is admitted, indeed, that these terms are applied immediately to outward and visible bodies of people; but this is considered sufficient of itself to show, that they are not to be construed strictly, but with great latitude rather and accommodation. The titles "elect," "beloved of God," "called to be saints," "sanctified in Christ Jesus," &c., are taken to refer only to the profession of Christians and the avowed object of their being gathered into ecclesiastical associations. They are for the most part borrowed too from the old Jewish economy, being a simple transfer to the Christian Church, outwardly considered, of forms of thought and modes of speech, with which the Jewish mind had long been familiar as applied to the Old Testament theocracy, under a like outward view. Christianity, however, it is assumed, is of altogether too spiritual a nature to be adequately measured by any such simply outward conceptions; and it is held to be clear enough, that there was very much in the actual condition of those to whom they are thus collectively applied, which forbids the thought of their being employed in any other light. In this way, these conceptions, great as they may seem to be in sound, are virtually shorn of significance and

force. The heavenly or divine side of Christianity, as represented by them, falls away before its merely human or earthly side. The Church comes to be nothing more than a particular form of the general life of the world, in its relation to religion and piety. It offers facilities and opportunities for spiritual culture; but these are by no means confined to its bosom. All resolves itself at last into the sincere belief of certain doctrines, and the earnest practice of certain virtues, which have no *necessary* dependence on the Church.

How completely this system of thought fails to do justice to the Epistles of the New Testament, we need not spend time now in endeavoring to show. Our business at present is more immediately with the opposite form of onesided thinking presented to us by the Calvinistic tendency; for this it is that governs throughout the New Testament exegesis of Dr. Hodge, as it comes before us in his Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians.

Here we have a false sublimation of the idea of grace, by which in the end serious wrong is done to the proper human side of the Christian salvation. All is made to resolve itself into divine agency, under such a form as fairly lifts the process of redemption out of the sphere of man's proper life, and causes it to go forward in another and different sphere altogether. The doctrine of election, turning on the notion of an absolute unconditional decree in the mind of God, is made to be the principle, and only really efficient cause, we may say, of the whole work. God having of his mere good pleasure determined, from all eternity, to save a certain fixed number of persons belonging to the human family, and not to save any besides, is supposed then to have ordered the entire plan of redemption in subordination to this purpose. All the provisions of his grace, including the fact of the Incarnation itself, the atonement made by Christ's death, the benefits of his resurrection, the mission of the Holy Ghost, the establishment of the Church, the Bible, the ministry of reconciliation, and the holy sacraments, are conditioned and limited, according to this view,

by the settled and foregone conclusion which it is proposed to reach by their means; becoming under such aspect, a sort of outward mechanical apparatus merely in its service. The result is an ultra spiritualistic, shadowy idea of redemption, in which no real union is allowed after all to have place between the powers of heaven and the necessities of earth; and in full correspondence with this, a complete dualism is brought into the conception of the Christian life also, regarded as the subjective or experimental appropriation, on the part of believers, of the grace thus objectively provided on their behalf. Human and divine factors are indeed both acknowledged, as entering in some way together into the process of conversion and sanctification; but no room is found for their free and harmonious coöperation. God becomes all, and man practically nothing; the consequence of which here again is, that religion becomes a scheme of mere abstract spiritualism, which, carried out consistently, can hardly fail to turn it at last into a cloud-like phantom or hollow shadow, the counterpart in full of its own profoundly kindred error, the christological dream of the ancient Gnostics.

For the application of this system to the exposition of the New Testament, we could have no better example than Dr. Hodge's Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians. It proceeds upon the Calvinistic hypothesis, as now described, from beginning to end. So far as we can see, too, he does not shrink from acknowledging this hypothesis in its only fully consistent form, the supralapsarian conception, we mean, as held by Calvin himself, though not generally by his followers. According to that conception, as is well known, the decree of election, issuing in the salvation of the elect as the last end of God's works, so far as man is concerned, is taken to precede and govern in the order of being, not simply the idea of redemption, but the idea also of the fall itself; the amount of which is, that God, having in mind his own glorification in the salvation of the elect and perdition of the non-elect, determined first the creation of the race, and then its fall, in order to make room

for what was his ulterior purpose in that other form. Dr. Hodge does not, indeed, in so many words, adopt this supralapsarian theory; but it is the only view, we think, that suits what he says of the predestination of a fixed number of human beings, from all eternity, to everlasting life. It is certain, at all events, that this decree is made by him to be the *principium* of everything that is comprehended in the scheme of redemption itself, and that all its arrangements and provisions, accordingly, are considered as being circumscribed and limited by it in their force. They are universally for the elect only, and no part of the fallen world besides. Their scope and efficiency are absolutely bounded by the range of this narrow circle, unalterably settled in the Divine mind from all eternity, and cannot be said to extend beyond this really in any direction whatever. Predestination in this sense, and no other, is the "primal fountain," we are told, "of all spiritual blessings," as involving for the saints their "election to holiness before the foundation of the world." The mystery of the Incarnation thus took place only for the elect, whom it was determined beforehand thus to save. Aside from them, it would not have occurred at all; and for the rest of the world it has in fact no saving purpose or power of any sort. The rest of the world is not in a salvable state; for the economy of the Gospel is such, that the principle of its grace, considered here as an absolute decree in the Divine mind, cannot be said to reach even potentially those who stand outside the circumference of this decree. Salvation, as a possibility only, has just as little significance for them, as it would have if they belonged to another world entirely. Power to become the sons of God, the great privilege and prerogative of as many as receive Christ (John 1: 12), belong, exclusively, to the elect. All others are doomed to hopeless impenitency and unbelief. Alas, what *should* they believe, if this view of the Gospel be itself the very truth of God which they are bound, under pain of damnation, to receive? For any of the non-elect to believe that Christ died for *them*, or that he is willing now to save them, must

be, according to Dr. Hodge's scheme, to believe what is absolutely and eternally untrue. To agree at all with the actual truth of things, *their* faith must own and confess precisely the reverse. All this, we know, sounds monstrous enough. But we hold it to be a perfectly fair, unvarnished representation of the theology, which Dr. Hodge has brought with him as the compass and pole-star of his observations at St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. The doctrine of election, as he holds it, involves beyond the possibility of logical escape, the notion of a corresponding partiality and limitation in all the arrangements of grace. Make such a decree the principle of salvation, and it must necessarily reduce the means of salvation throughout to the measure of its own action and intention. It will be no longer true, that Christ died for all men, made atonement for all, triumphed over death for all, and now reigns head over all things to the Church for all, having sent forth his ministers to preach repentance and faith to all, that they might be saved. Regarded as a merely external administration indeed, Christianity may claim and appear also to possess such universality of character. But looking to its proper spiritual economy, we find all to be different. In God's mind, it is a plan to save the elect only; the agency of his Spirit goes along with it, to make it certainly efficacious for this end; beyond this it carries in it neither purpose nor power of grace for any of the children of men.

Such a predestination to eternal life, moreover, must necessarily draw after it, in the case of those who are its subjects, whatever is required to go forward in their personal experience, in order that they may be prepared finally for this glorious result. The beginning and end of revelation, for every predestinated saint, are joined together with unalterable necessity from the start. No room is left thus to conceive of any real power on the part of men themselves, either to defeat or make sure their heavenly calling. What may *seem* to be attributed to human agency in this way by the Scriptures, must be regarded as having place in show only and outward appearance. The decree of election

rules all, and turns the subjective side of redemption, as well as its objective side, into a sort of unreal parade, in which shadows are set before us continually for actual substances and really existing things. Dr. Hodge takes it for granted everywhere, that those whom St. Paul addresses as the "called of God in Christ," are such as have been individually and separately predestinated to salvation from all eternity, and that it is of course impossible for them in such view not to be saved. This does not imply that they can be saved in their sins, or without means and conditions; but it does unquestionably mean, that whatever may be needed in such form for the final result, is made infallibly certain by the same decree that fixes the certainty of the result itself. Predestination involves as its necessary indissoluble sequences, in the case of every individual to whom it extends, effectual calling, justification, sanctification, the resurrection of the just, and full glorification finally in heaven. There is no room in the theory for distinguishing between what is potential only and what is actual. Election to certain blessings, is taken to include as a matter of course the consequence of coming into their possession and fruition. The "elect" addressed by St. Paul, according to the Commentary before us, are "the actual recipients of the blessings spoken of, viz: holiness, sonship, remission of sins, and eternal life."

Out of this way of looking at the subject arises of necessity a corresponding view of the Church. It is confessedly the body of the "elect," in the New Testament sense of that term. It is made up plainly, in St. Paul's view, of those whom he addresses as "saints," as the "called of God," as those who are "sanctified in Christ Jesus," as those whose vast privileges he describes as being in their measure a sort of counterpart of the resurrection and exaltation of Christ himself. It is a conception for him plainly, which is of one and the same measure precisely with these titles and representations. Settle it then that the true Scriptural sense of such terms is what we find it assumed to be always by the system before us, and we may see

at once how the notion of the Church must shape itself to agree with the requirements of the case. It can no longer be considered as an outward and visible organization at all, except in an imperfect and improper sense. In its true nature, it can be regarded only as an invisible constitution, the community of the righteous as they are known to God. Such is the view presented to us very explicitly by Dr. Hodge. Election, he tells us, does not regard "any external community or society as such" (p. 29). Again we are told, that if election is to holiness, it follows that "individuals, and not communities or nations are the objects of it" (p. 35). Again, commenting (in his usual style of begging dogmatically the whole question he pretends exegetically to settle) on the words *which is his body*, he says: "This is the radical or formative idea of the Church. From this idea are to be developed its nature, its attributes, and its prerogatives. It is the indwelling of the Spirit of Christ, that constitutes the Church his body. And, therefore, those only in whom the Spirit dwells are constituent members of the true Church. But the Spirit does not dwell in church officers, nor especially in prelates, as such; nor in the baptized, as such; nor in the mere external professors of the true religion; but in true believers, who therefore constitute that Church which is the body of Christ, and to which its attributes and prerogatives belong" (pp. 87, 88). The following is still more distinct: "The idea of the Church which underlies this paragraph (Eph. 2: 19-22), is that which is every where presented in the New Testament. The Church is the body of Christ. It consists of those in whom he dwells by his Spirit. To be an alien from the Church, therefore, is to be an alien from God. It is to be without Christ and without hope. The Church of which this is said is not the nominal, external, visible Church as such, but the true people of God. As however the Scriptures always speak of men according to their profession, calling those who profess faith, believers, and those who confess Christ, Christians; so they speak of the visible Church as the true Church, and predicate of the former

what is true only of the latter. The Gentiles while aliens from the Church were without Christ, without God, and without hope; when amalgamated with the Church, they became the habitation of God through the Spirit. Such many of them truly were, such they all professed to be, and they are, therefore, addressed in that character. But union with the visible Church no more made them real partakers of the Spirit of Christ, than the profession of faith made them living believers" (pp. 123, 124).

How exceedingly arbitrary all this is, and how little it agrees with the plain text of St. Paul himself, it is not our business just now to show. We bring it forward simply to exemplify the view which Dr. Hodge takes of the Church, from one end of his Commentary to the other. It agrees in full with his conception of the nature of Christianity, as being essentially a scheme of pure abstract spiritualism, starting in the election of certain individuals to salvation, and having no real significance or force beyond the carrying out of this purpose, which, at the same time, it cannot fail infallibly to reach. Under no such aspect can the Church be regarded as an outward and visible organization, carrying in it as such the powers of a higher world. Indeed it can be no *organization* at all; except in the character of a mental notion merely employed to generalize what are held to be the common attributes of its constituent members, as they are known certainly to God, though with no certainty to the world or to one another. It answers only to the invisible process of redemption, as it lies behind the dramatic show with which it is made to play its part in the outward world, and not at all to this show itself. These two conceptions fall asunder completely. There is no inward connection between them. The invisible fact and the visible fact come to no organic union whatever. They do not meet together in the idea of any single constitution, but present to our contemplation always what must be regarded as two Churches in truth instead of one. The scheme in this view is grossly dualistic.

Such dualism subverts really the old doctrine of the

Church, as it entered into the faith of the first ages, and continues to challenge the faith of the world still in the Apostles' Creed. It converts its whole being into a shadow, which, while it seems to promise much, means at last literally nothing for the process of man's salvation. Neither the true Church, in the sense of Dr. Hodge's distinction, nor the Church which is such in name only and outward show, can be said to add anything really to the "mystery of godliness," as otherwise ordered and made sure for its own ends. Neither the visible nor the invisible Church can be regarded in the light of a constitution, intervening with any real force between heaven and earth, and serving as the necessary form of all actual correspondence between them in the way of grace.

So far as the visible Church is concerned, this is at once plain. The system makes it to be, in and of itself, a mere profession of Christianity, a simply human association, a name and form at best and nothing more. If the presence of the Spirit go with it at all, it is there as something outwardly and mechanically joined with the other conception, and not as really belonging to it in any proper sense whatever. There is nothing indeed which the system is more ready to denounce, than the imagination of any sort of virtue or force for the purposes of salvation in the forms of religion as such; an imagination, indeed, which all may easily enough see to be both dangerous and absurd, if the premises of this judgment relating to the nature of the Church itself be allowed to go unquestioned. Grant that the visible side of Christianity in such view, its outward profession and forms, its whole constitution as a Church, carries in it no necessary relation whatever to its invisible privileges and powers; and it needs no farther argument certainly to prove that it must jeopardize then all the interests of piety, to lay stress on any such visibility and externalism, as having in themselves anything to do really with the proper kingdom of God, which is described as being within men, and as being "not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." The

dualistic stand-point of the system in question, shuts it up to this judgment, and renders it, we may say, logically impossible for it to look at the subject in any other light. It is ever ready, accordingly, to disparage all trust in the forms of religion, and to insist on the claims of its inward life and spirit, as something wholly independent of every such external aid. It is the foe constitutionally of the churchly, the priestly, the sacramental in religion, under every form and shape. Dr. Hodge himself loses no opportunity of striking at these conceptions, wherever they come in his way; and often, indeed, allows himself to go out of his way for the purpose.

But the invisible Church of this dualistic theory is no more suited than its notion of the visible Church, for the office here in question; and just as little account is made of it in fact under any such view. It adds nothing to the conception of Christianity, as apprehended without it. It is in truth nothing more than this conception itself, thus previously full and complete. It is at best the comprehension only of the "elect," whose salvation is a fact already secured under quite another aspect and view, and who thus bring with them in their character of saints all that is made to belong to them in its communion.

What has been now said may serve sufficiently to show the general nature of the Calvinistic hypothesis, on which Dr. Hodge relies so confidently for the right interpretation of the Epistle to the Ephesians. It is sufficient also to show, we think, how unequal his Commentary must necessarily be to the task of meeting and solving what we have already seen to be the fundamental exegetical problem brought to view in the structure of the Epistle itself. The hypothesis does not answer at all to the terms and conditions of this problem, as it has been already stated and described. It does not even seek to reconcile and unite the two apparently discrepant views of Christianity that run through the Epistle. It throws itself upon one of these views in a great measure exclusively of the other; and in this way violently breaks the knot which it has no power

to unloose. It does well in asserting over against Arminianism the claims of grace as forming in the work of redemption an order of life and power distinct from nature and above it ; but doing this in such a way as practically to sunder the two spheres altogether, it falls into a like one-sidedness in the opposite direction, making so much of God's agency as to turn the activity of man in fact into mere dumb show. With such a character, how can it possibly do justice to the text of the New Testament, or serve as a mirror to reflect the mind of St. Paul ? Looking at the theory then as it is in itself, and comparing it with the plain demands of the case, we have the most perfect right to anticipate not any more particular investigation, and to say beforehand that the Commentary before us cannot possibly give us the true scope and sense of the Epistle it pretends to expound. The difficulty is not with the learning or ability of its distinguished author. These may be all that could be expected or desired. It lies in the preconceived scheme of thought which he feels himself bound to apply to the text, as the necessary norm of its meaning ; but which is found to be in truth so foreign from the genius of the text itself, that no amount of learning can ever be able to interpret this faithfully and fairly by its means.

If this general *a priori* judgment in regard to the work at large be at all correct, we may take it for granted that it cannot fail to be corroborated and confirmed by an examination of it in its details. It is only what might be anticipated, therefore, when we look into it, and find its actual course of exposition attended with embarrassment and contradiction from the very start.

Take first of all the topic of election, which is found to be of such cardinal significance for the interpretation of the whole Epistle. With the merits of the doctrine itself in its Calvinistic form, as held by Dr. Hodge, we are not here immediately concerned. We have nothing to do with it now as a question of metaphysics or of general theology. What we have before us is a simple point of exegesis, which is not to be settled by any such speculation one way or the

other. We ask not, whether the Calvinistic dogma, in itself considered, be right or wrong; but whether it be really and truly what was in the mind of St. Paul in writing this Epistle to the Ephesians, so as to be still the proper key to the actual sense of the Epistle itself. That is now the only question; and it is one which we find ourselves at no loss whatever to answer. The election of grace on which so much stress is laid by St. Paul, and which is made by him here and elsewhere to underlie the whole conception of the Christian Church, is *not* just of one and the same order with the "absolute decree" of Calvinism, regarded as determining the destination of every man to glory or perdition from all eternity. To settle this point, it is not necessary that we should be able to explain in full the relation of the two forms of thinking to each other; nor even that we should have it in our power to comprehend precisely the actual view of the Apostle at all points. It is enough to see, that the suppositions and assumptions which are involved in the one hypothesis, cannot be brought by any strain of logic to agree with what is plainly postulated and required by the other. No rule can be more sure or easy of application than this; and we need no other, for fully deciding the question here in hand.

The Calvinistic theory of election, presented to us in the Commentary, connects the beginning of salvation for all who are predestinated to life indissolubly with its end. There is no room to conceive of it coming short of its ultimate purpose in a single case. In addressing then "the saints and faithful in Christ Jesus" at Ephesus, St. Paul is to be regarded, according to this view, as having in his mind's eye directly those in whom this absolute decree had already begun to work surely towards its own end, and no others. None besides may be thought of as having any true denizenship in the kingdom of God. The conception of that kingdom is held to be necessarily of one and the same measure, with the actual operation of this absolute decree in those who are its subjects. They alone have part really in the "vocation" of the Gospel; and for them

this heavenly calling is itself the guaranty and pledge, most surely, of everlasting life.

But now it must be plain, we think, for any unsophisticated reader, looking into the Epistle itself, that its theory of distinguishing grace, whatever it may be, is something widely different from this, something which refuses to coalesce with it altogether, and that demands absolutely quite another construction of Christianity. The "elect," whom St. Paul addresses, whom he describes as "called to be saints" and as "sitting in heavenly places in Christ Jesus," and who form for him the idea of the Church which is "the body of Christ, the fulness of him that filleth all in all," are *not* at once, to his mind, such as have been predestinated by an absolute decree, from all eternity, to everlasting salvation, and are now regarded as moving forward by the power of it, with unerring certainty, to this pre-ordained result. We have plain evidence of the contrary in every part of the Epistle. The difficulties it offers in the way of Dr. Hodge's scheme, are of the most unyielding kind; and they come up in every chapter, we had almost said in every paragraph and verse; so that recourse must be had everywhere to arbitrary and unnatural suppositions, to set them aside. The Epistle goes throughout on the supposition, (common, we may add, to the entire New Testament,) that those whom it addresses as Christians, chosen and called of God to the high and glorious privileges of the Church, might still fail to "make their calling and election sure." This single fact, too plain to be disputed by any honest and unprejudiced mind, is sufficient to settle the question under consideration. It shows conclusively that the "elect" in the sense of St. Paul, are not the same with the "elect" in Calvin's sense; and that the New Testament conception of the Church is something much wider than any theological view, by which it is made to be the invisible comprehension simply of that favored class whom God has predestinated to everlasting life, and in whose case thus the work of salvation once begun has no power ever to fail.

"Those who were once enlightened," we learn from Heb. 6: 4-6, "and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come," may after all so fall away that it shall be impossible to renew them again to repentance. Much ado has been made by some with this passage, on account of its broad opposition to the Calvinistic theory of grace, and strange shifts have been resorted to for the purpose of bending it from the plain natural sense of its own words; as though it formed a sort of solitary exception to the general tenor of the New Testament teachings on the same subject. But the truth is, the only singularity of the passage consists in the immediateness and strength of the terms it employs, to express the general thought with which it is charged. The thought itself, so far as its material substance is concerned, forms the very hinge, we may say, on which the instructions and warnings of the Epistle to the Hebrews most manifestly turn from beginning to end. Throughout it goes upon the supposition, that there is such a thing as sinning wilfully and fatally after men have received the knowledge of the truth (ch. 10: 26-29); that those who have been "illuminated," and who have passed through many trials joyfully in the service of Christ, may yet "cast away their confidence," and so lose all the benefit of their previous good confession (v. 32-35); that those who have believed, and need only patience and perseverance to win the crown of life, may still "draw back unto perdition" (v. 36-39); that as the ancient Israelites came short of the land of promise, so Christians now may come short of the heavenly rest (ch. 3: 7-12); that the apostacy of the Old Testament people of God forms a fair and legitimate example for the warning of his people under the New Testament (ch. 4: 1-3); that there is full opportunity and occasion, therefore, for exhorting these last to "take heed," to "fear," to "labor," lest any of them should be "hardened through the deceitfulness of sin," and so "fall after the same example of unbelief" (3: 12-14. 4: 1, 11). The great object of

the Epistle indeed is to fortify the Hebrew converts to whom it is addressed, against the peril of falling away from their Christian profession and hope; a peril, which is regarded not only as conceivable, but as absolutely imminent and hard at hand, creating just cause for earnest fear, and needing to be met with the most constant watchfulness and care. It deserves to be well considered, moreover, that the point of apprehension throughout is made to be, in the case of these converts, not the reality of their conversion itself as a past or present fact, but wholly and only its endurance in time to come. The question is not whether they had been already truly joined to Christ, whether they had experienced at all the power of the new truth, and so possessed in themselves the proper evidences of being in a state of grace, and having the inward life of religion as distinguished from its outward profession and form; but simply, when they should continue faithful and true to the privileges of their actually existing condition, which is presumed, as a matter of course, it would appear, to include in it all that is needed for their salvation. All depends on this perseverance. "We are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the *beginning* of our confidence steadfast unto the *end*" (3: 14). We must not be slothful, but "followers of them who through *faith* and *patience* inherit the promises" (6: 12). "Let us *hold fast* the profession of our faith *without wavering*; for he is faithful that promised" (10: 23). Such is the general tenor and burden of exhortation from one end of the Epistle to the other; involving the assumption everywhere that the Christians for whom it was written belonged really and truly to the "household of faith," and yet had no security whatever of being finally saved for this reason. An assumption, it is hardly necessary to say, with which the Calvinistic notion of the Church can never be made to agree by any ingenuity or art.

Two different ways indeed have been tried, to get clear of the difficulty; but they deserve to be considered miserable *evasions* only, and nothing more. Only to state them, is to expose their dishonesty and want of force. One of

them consists in a resort to the most arbitrary imagination, that the case towards which these warnings are directed is *hypothetical* only, without the possibility of its ever becoming actual and real. "*If they shall fall away,*" expresses a contingency, possible enough on the side of believers themselves, against which in such view, accordingly, it is right that they should be solemnly warned; but which is, at the same time, on God's side, made to be graciously impossible, in the case of all, who, as the objects of his election in eternity, are the only real subjects of his salvation in time. So from first to last, the Epistle to the Hebrews is to be regarded as an argument and warning powerfully turned towards a form of danger, represented as urgent and dreadful, which nevertheless the inspired writer himself, (not less knowing in the matter, we may suppose, than Calvin,) well understood to be for the really elect, and therefore really "illuminated," (the only true membership of the invisible and only true Church,) a fiction simply of the common understanding, and no proper reality whatever! It is difficult to conceive of any exegesis, more monstrous than this. The other evasion, however, carries with it just as little title to respect. It consists in supposing, that the possibility of apostacy contemplated in the Epistle holds good only of such as own the claims of religion in an outward way, without being brought savingly under its power; and that this, therefore, is the only case, which was really before the mind of the sacred writer, in the strong language he allows himself to use on the subject. He is to be considered thus as writing in such strain, not really for the elect (in Calvin's sense), but for the non-elect; who, strictly speaking, had no saving grace, nor even so much as the possibility of it, to fall away from; no heavenly birthright to sell for any price, great or small; no faith whatever from which to draw back to perdition; but who might be warned against the guilt and danger of apostacy notwithstanding, in form merely and for the sake of effect, as having it in their power to fall away at least from the semblance of grace, and to give up a hypocritical

profession of religion for no profession at all ! The imagination is purely absurd. It stands before us, without a shadow of reason to shield it from contempt. The Epistle is addressed throughout, not to the world at large, but to those who are regarded and spoken of as believers gathered out of the world into the bosom of the Christian Church ; not to such under any divided view, as having been partly true saints and partly saints only in name and form, with an eye now to the one class and then again to the other, but to their whole society collectively taken ; and those so addressed, are presumed to be in this collective capacity or character, " holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling," possessing by their Christian profession a real, and not simply nominal, interest in the privileges of the Church, its opportunities of grace, its full powers of salvation ; while at the very same time, and under the same general view, they are presumed again to be exposed most really to the possibility of losing all and perishing finally through unbelief.

And so with the Epistles of the New Testament in general. They look, in all their communications, directly and exclusively to the Church as distinguished from the world, to the congregation of those who are denominated saints, and described as the chosen and called of God in Christ Jesus. They keep themselves continually to this rule. They have to do only with " them that are within " (1 Cor. 5 : 12), and not at all with " them that are without." With them that are within, moreover, they have to do plainly in their collective character. It is not to a part only they speak, a still narrower circle mentally described within the limits of this first outward distinction. Not a particle of evidence do they show, in favor of any such arbitrary supposition. They speak to bodies of men, separated from the rest of the world in a visible, external way ; and to these, as such, they refer without hesitation the lofty titles, the high privileges, the heavenly immunities and prerogatives of the Christian Church. Yet of those who are regarded as partaking of this glorious distinction, in such

general view, do they again go on with just as little hesitation, to predicate, at the same time, directly and indirectly, the real possibility of sin, in forms involving an entire forfeiture of every advantage they had come to possess. However it may be with the Calvinistic doctrine of election, it is certain that the election and vocation here brought into view, carry with them no sort of guaranty whatever for the final salvation of their subjects.

The "elect" of St. Peter, chosen according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" (1 Peter 1: 2), "begotten again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead" (v. 3), "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation" (v. 5), "redeemed from their vain conversation received by tradition from their fathers, not with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" (v. 18, 19), who had "purified their hearts in obeying the truth through the Spirit" (v. 22), who were "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people," appointed and set apart to "show forth the praises of him who had called them out of darkness into his marvellous light" (2: 9); the "elect" of St. Peter, we say, who hold so high a place in his mind, and into the mystery of whose vocation even "the angels desire to look" (1: 12), are still to his inspired view compassed about with all sorts of temptation and danger, requiring them to "pass the time of their sojourning here in fear" (v. 17), and need to be exhorted against all sorts of deadly sin, in a strain which clearly implies everywhere the apprehension of its full *possibility*, as something to which the privileges of their Christian state formed neither bar nor let in any sense whatever. It is not enough in his view, that those whom he addresses had "obtained like precious faith with himself through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" (2 Peter 1: 1); nor that "his divine power had given unto them all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through

the knowledge of him that had called them to glory and virtue" (v. 3); nor that "having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust," they had it in their power by the exceeding great and precious promises" of the Gospel to be "partakers of the divine nature" (v. 3). All this only opens the way for the successful cultivation of the Christian graces and virtues (v. 5-7); and so it is added: "If these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that *he was purged from his old sins*. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to *make your calling and election sure*; for if ye do these things ye shall *never fall*: for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." If these words mean anything whatever, their plain sense undoubtedly is, that those who were elected and called to salvation, in St. Peter's sense, and who had been purged also from their old sins, were capable, nevertheless, of reverting again to their former state, and of so falling as never to enter heaven; the very case, indeed, of some he speaks of as "having escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," and being "again entangled therein and overcome," so that "the latter end was worse with them than the beginning" (2: 20). In full conformity with this view, accordingly, all ends with the exhortation: "Ye, therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness" (3: 17).

In like manner, the "elect" again of St. Paul are plainly represented to us in every direction, as being highly exalted indeed by their position in the way of opportunity and power to be saved; nay as possessing in such form the grace of incipient salvation itself; but never as being set apart to salvation in full, with infallible certainty, and beyond the possibility of failure, in the Calvinistic sense.

The very opposite of this, on the contrary, is presumed in every sort of way. Throughout his Epistles, precepts and exhortations and warnings of the most solemn kind, which we have no right surely to regard as the empty skiomachy of one who beats the air, bear witness to the earnest apprehension he had of the liability of Christians to be overtaken with errors and sins involving a complete defection from the Christian faith; while complaints of heresy and corruption actually at work in the Churches furnish ample evidence, mournful and sad, that this apprehension was by no means without ground. What strange forms of seemingly incompatible carnality and worldliness, do we not find mixing themselves with the Christian profession of the Church at Corinth, composed of "them that were sanctified in Christ Jesus and called to be saints"? Theirs, it is signified to us, was no common election. "I thank my God always on your behalf," writes the venerable Apostle, "for the grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ; that in every thing ye are enriched by him, in all utterance, and in all knowledge; even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you: So that ye come behind in no gift; waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall also confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ. God is faithful, by whom ye were called into the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord" (1 Cor. 1: 4-9). And then follows, almost in the same breath, a severe reprimand of their divisions and contentions; in reference to which he says subsequently: "I brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk, and not with meat; for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able. For ye are yet carnal; for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal and walk as men?" (3: 1-3). And this is only the beginning of censure. The case grows worse as we proceed; and forms of evil come into view, as really existing, or at any rate, as really conceivable in this organization of saints "called

into the fellowship of Jesus Christ," which it is hard in truth to reconcile with our common ideal of a primitive Apostolical Church, and which for the honor of Christianity we might almost wish to have been either unnoticed altogether, or at least noticed in a more guarded and qualified way. There was no security in their communion, it seems, with all its celestial privileges, from the presence of even gross sins. A man that was called a "brother," one among the number of the "*ἀλητοὶ ἀγατοί*," might be nevertheless "a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner" (5 : 11); a monstrous case of course which is noticed only as calling for discipline and exclusion; the very supposition of which, however, is sufficient to show how real and near at hand for the Apostle's mind the whole bad possibility was of which we are now speaking, and how wide a range also he was willing to concede to it in his theory of the Christian Church. Here is another passage which sounds strangely, bearing on the same point : "Why do ye not rather take wrong? why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded? Nay, ye *do* wrong, and defraud, and that your brethren! Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such *were* some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God" (6 : 7-11). And yet with all this purgation from their old sins, environed still, it would seem, with the danger of again coming under their power, and needing to be sharply warned of the fact, in terms that strike the ear certainly as better befitting the "children of disobedience" than the "household of faith"! Take another example: "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? Shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid."—"Flee fornication.

Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication, sinneth against his own body. What! know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?" (6 : 12-20.) Only reflect on the opposite terms of this bold hypothesis, and then consider how much is signified by the *possibility* it serves to set before our view.

It would be easy to multiply exemplifications of the same general thought still farther from both the Epistles to the Corinthians. But the argument does not require it; and so we stop. It would be easy, moreover, to take St. Paul's other Epistles, one after another, and to show that they are all constructed throughout on precisely the same view of Christianity. But neither is this now necessary. The matter is abundantly plain, for all who care to study it in the light of the observations already made. These Epistles are all for Christians, for those who are considered and spoken of collectively as the chosen and called of God; and yet it is continually taken for granted in them, notwithstanding, that it was most perfectly possible for these very same persons to walk unworthily of their vocation, to forfeit their privileges, to part with their glorious birthright, to turn the grace of God into licentiousness, to make shipwreck of the faith, and so to come short eventually of everlasting life. Cases of such defection, as having actually occurred, are brought into view largely and without the least reserve; examples of unfaithfulness looking towards it are set before us under all imaginable aspects and forms; while the danger of it, as something not simply imaginary but most real and close at hand, (the "easily besetting sin" of Heb. 12: 1,) is everywhere powerfully and irresistibly implied by cautions and persuasions, admonitions and exhortations, prohibitions and precepts, which must be considered absolutely void of meaning in any other view.

We repeat then what we have said before. The doctrine of election in the common sense of the New Testament, and as we have it proclaimed alike by St. Peter and St.

Paul, is not the doctrine of election which is set before us in the theology of John Calvin. This is our thesis ; and for the present, (let it be well kept in mind,) nothing more than this. Our business now, as has been already said, is not with the merits of the Calvinistic dogma absolutely considered. The argument for it in its philosophico-theological form, as set forth for example by Schleiermacher, is one certainly which it can never be easy to meet. But the question now before us, is not one of philosophy or general theology. It is a question purely of exegesis. What we deny, is not the truth of metaphysical Calvinism as such, but its identity with the idea of election as it is found to underlie the conception of the Church in the sense of the New Testament. The two forms of thought, we say with the greatest confidence, are not the same. We hold it, therefore, for a fundamental fault in this Commentary of Dr. Hodge, that the difference between them is altogether overlooked, that St. Paul's doctrine of the "election of grace" is arbitrarily taken to be precisely of one measure with the doctrine of predestination to eternal life as held by Calvin, and that this last is then used as a key throughout, instead of the first, to open and expound the deep meaning of the Epistle to the Ephesians.

The consequences of so radical a mistake cannot fail, of course, to extend very far. They must affect the complexion of the entire Commentary, and may be expected seriously to vitiate the value of its expositions at every point. Our limits, however, will not allow us to pursue the subject any farther at the present time. We hope to take it up again hereafter, in another article. This will give us an opportunity of examining more fully the true import and bearing of St. Paul's idea of election ; as it will make it necessary for us also, to go somewhat particularly into the consideration of his doctrine of the Church ; the proper parallel of that other idea, by the help of which alone it is possible to satisfy the opposing conditions of the great exegetical problem which runs, as we have already seen, through all his Epistles, so as to bring into their exposition

the feeling of order, harmony and light. The true doctrine of the Church here is for the Calvinistic and Arminian theories, what the true doctrine of Christ's person was in the first centuries for the dreams of the Gnostic on the one side and the dreams of the Ebionite on the other, the glorious everlasting synthesis under a real form of what they have no power to unite except in the way of shadow.

J. W. N.

Windsor Place, Lancaster county, Pa.

ART. IV.—THE CHURCH SYSTEM AND THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

ALL false religions are dark unconscious endeavors toward the true. They are the creations and projections of human wants. In them we see fallen nature, under a sense of its misery, feeling after God. They are as the unsubstantial shadow on earth of the eagle which soars in life, and freedom, and glory above.

These outgoings of nature after the true good, are what vegetable growths are without the light of the sun from above upon them:—without strength, use or beauty, they fall back in helplessness and confusion to perish on the earth whence they sprang. They are not glorified in fruit. To the perfection of vegetable life, it is necessary that its upward endeavors be met by responding powers from heaven down; and these two must become one in the life of the plant. Every perfect plant unites in itself heaven and earth. So in true religion there must be a union of the heavenly and the earthly—the divine and the human. The deep, solemn soundings of humanity's heaving bosom

must be responded to by divinity's merciful condescension.

This humanity has ever felt—after this human spirits have ever cried. The voice, which, like the plaintive cry of a lost one in a desert, sounds down to us through all the ages past, is: How shall we rise to God; or how shall we bring God down to us? How shall heaven and earth be brought peacefully together again? Where is the long lost golden age in which God and man shall again walk together? Who shall usher in the Advent of "the vision of peace"—* when all this painful sense of alienation shall be taken away—when man shall meet that counterpart of his being which will respond to his restless spirit—when the Philosopher shall find his absolute True, the Moralist his chief Good, the Poet his long sought Beautiful, and all hearts that Ideal which they see not but love, and which they reach out to embrace in the visions of the day, and, the dreams of the night.

The endeavors of heathenism are before us in the pages of history, struggling both ways, to solve the problem of mystery. The paganism of the East—if we take an historical position at the place of Christ's birth—has labored to bring God down to man; that of the West, to raise man up to God. The Eastern religions rest on Incarnations of God: the Western on Deifications of man. In Thibet, Japan, India, Tartary, Siam, and other provinces, their gods are born of virgins—the gods become men. Among the Greeks, Romans, and northern nations, the gods are deified men.

Here are the two great schemes of paganism, which look to the same end—to bring together heaven and earth, God and man—a prophecy of what is fulfilled, though not in them.

Meanwhile there is another movement in the history of the world—Judaism. This is directed, not by earthly, but by heavenly factors. In its nature does not only speak from earth but God from heaven. It promises, and brings,

* In allusion to the word Jerusalem, the type of the Church, which means "the vision or possession of peace."

the fulfillment of both the pagan endeavors. In Judaism, from the dim morning of ages, through all the harmony and discord of history sounds the steady voice: He shall come—the seed of the woman—the child, Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God—the divine shall assume the human, the human shall partake of the divine. He, the God-man, shall verify in himself all that has been reached after by the incarnations of the East, and the deifications of the West.

He did come—just at the time when these two pagan endeavors had exhausted themselves—when Judaism itself had run its course, and presented to view only an outward chrysalis, dead and dryer as the time drew near when its inward life should spring forth in a higher and more glorious form. Then was the fulness of time—the contact of the ages—the focus of the world's historical tendencies;—and he came, who was at the same time, “the desire of all nations,” and the “hope of Israel.” In Bethlehem, amid a light and glory that came not from sun or star, while heaven, through angelic choirs, sung down its glorious anthem of salutation, and earth, through the shepherds, responded in joy as they could, eternal condescension inaugurated “the vision of peace.”

Now the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily in the human. Humanity had a new head, and a new life. Moreover, the God-man stood in historical unity with Judaism. He came not to destroy, but to fulfil. He was circumcised—baptized—kept the feasts—a Jew. He gathered around him the lost sheep of the house of Israel first, and through them proclaimed salvation to all the ends of the earth.

Immediately there revealed itself in Him a plenary power, that transcended the limits of Jewish forms. He stood in it, but proclaimed himself before it, and over it. His power wrought in it as the life in a plant which hastens to the flower and the fruit. The last prophet of the old, and the first of the new, cried out: It must decrease, He must increase. He was its substance; and hence he pointed not to it, but to himself. “I am life and resurrection!” His

words were power. Once again, He stood on earth, who spake and it was done. Authority was in his words, melting power in His looks, life in His touch. The echoes of His words were hearing to the deaf, sight to the blind, health to the sick, life to the dead, exorcism to the possessed, and pardon to the penitent. He met life and sanctified it—He met death and abolished it—He met hell and triumphed over it!

Those whom he called around Him, He impregnated with His own life, and endowed with authority. When the time came that He should disappear from view, and as Head of all, carry captivity captive into the heavens that He might fill all things, He provided for the continuance of His presence and power in the world. He commissioned a ministry as the organs of His life—He instituted sacraments as channels of His grace—He sent the Holy Ghost as His own Spirit, to work through the ministry and the sacraments upon the people—thus constituting the Church as the body of Christ, the dispensation of the Spirit, the mother of us all.

Thus we have a true view of the nature of the Church, as it is historically indicated. It is not a projection of human wants, as in pagan systems. It is not a creation from earth up, but from heaven down. It is a kingdom which comes to meet human wants, and to fill them out. Behold the tabernacle of God is with men. Its ministry are not only leaders of men to God, but bearers of God to man. The sacraments are not acts from men to God, but acts of God to men. The Spirit is not first in men to bring them into the Church, but first in the Church to open Himself and His grace to men. "Jerusalem which is above"—a power above men, moulding them—is above the world, but in it like the sun, the rain, the dew, the air, that brood over the life of earth, waking it to bloom and fruit.

Because it is above the world and yet active in it, it is free: free as the rays of the sun which color the flowers—free as the sailing clouds that scatter the gentle rain—free as the silently distilling dew that refreshes the grass—free as

the air of heaven, which carries vigor to all—free as the moving sap, as the growing twig, as the quivering leaf, as the blooming flower, as the pendant fruit. The life of the Head in heaven flows as freely in the Church as the blood in the body. It lives in her voice, entering the heart as a lovely song, causing the lips of those that are asleep to speak. It kindles in her “dove eyes” as a light and fire of holiest love. “Thy lips, O my spouse, drop as the honey-comb: honey and milk are under thy tongue; and the smell of thy garments is like the smell of Lebanon.” Salvation drops from her fingers in the water of baptism, flows in her wine-cup of blessings, and lies as latent life in the bread which she breaks. Her breath, in prayers and praise, is as the odor from fields of spices. Behold the mystical virgin full of grace—behold the Bride, the Lamb’s wife—behold the mother of us all.

We do not say that this sets before us *a* certain view of the Church; but it sets forth *the* true view. Another view is not one beside it, but one against it. Is the Church a mother or not? Is she begetting, or begotten? Is she a family or a crowd? Does she nourish and nurture, or is she nourished and nurtured? Does she produce and sustain her children, or do they produce and sustain her? Is she the generatrix of saints, or the receptacle of saints? Is she a home, or a boarding-house?

These questions present two views of the Church, which are opposite to one another, and beyond reconciliation. The one is “the bond-maid,” the other “the free-woman.” They of the bond-woman “are born after the flesh”; they of the free-woman “are by promise.” “These are the two covenants; the one from Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage”; the other is Jerusalem, which is the mother of us all. The one is Ishmael, the independent wild-man, born by sin in a natural birth, dividing from his brethren, and setting up for himself, and, though abiding in their presence, lifting up his hand against them;—the other is Isaac, born by supernatural birth through faith, when Sarah “was past age.” From the one spring the restless

wandering hords of the desert, living on spoils; from the other the household of faith, around whose tents the land smiles in the light of peace, piety, art, science and civilization, with whom is the history and hope of the world, till all the nations shall be blest in her.

From these two views of the Church grow two systems of religion, which are not beside one another, the one good and the other better; but two systems against one another, the one true and the other false. They are distinguished, and may be characterized as: christological and anti-christological: churchly and un-churchly: sacramental and un-sacramental: educational and fanatical.

1. A true christology, that is a true view of Christ's person, underlies a true view of the Christian Church. There was, in the Incarnation, a real union of the divine nature with humanity. God became truly man; and a life union with a divine-human Saviour is the first and deepest ground of salvation. This, we have seen, heathenism struggled after—this came in Jesus of Nazareth. To be in Him is life and salvation. This is the kernel of the New Testament teaching. Without this it is worse than the play of Hamlet with Hamlet's part left out.

The opposite view, or that scheme which fails to take in this fundamental fact, makes the Incarnation of God a mere revelation of God in a man—a show of the divine in the human, without a true abiding union with it. Christ is made, not the source of salvation, but the means, the "causal source" of salvation—a power by delegation: an expedient, not a necessity: an extraordinary mission from the divine to the human, instead of a mystical oneness of the divine and the human. He became incarnate only the better to become the means of salvation—which is to be accomplished *by* Him, rather than *in* Him. He was the source of salvation, only as He secured for us the means of salvation—hence he is called the "causal source."*

* Dr. Hodge on the Ephesians, p. 240. We hope we have taken the author's true meaning of this phrase. Why add the adjective *causal*, if some limitation is not intended?

We refer to this subtle form of this error, because it speaks so much like the truth, and defines itself in plausible terms through venerable, learned, and pious lips. "Now the magicians of Egypt, they also did in like manner with their enchantments. For they cast down every one *his* rod, and they became serpents: but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods."

John calls this error a spirit—the spirit of anti-Christ—to indicate its subtlety. It has, however, not been without its bold, tangible embodiment in various forms. Those who have been taught by Church History—that touch-stone of error—may find along its path the broken skulls of numerous anti-Christa, once clad in mail and fierce in power, whom Christ and time have slain: Ebionism, Gnosticism, and Arianism which ignored the divine in Christ; Manicheism, which disparaged the human in Christ, and pretended an incarnation of the Holy Ghost in Manes; Nestorianism, which separated the two natures in Christ; The Arians, who denied both the truly divine and the truly human in Christ; Pelagianism which made Christ a mere teacher and assistant to man. Since the Reformation, we have the re-appearance of all these in forms gross and subtle, and an intermarrying of them in the strangest confusion—each one ornamenting itself with patches from the rest, and wearing, like Joseph, a coat of many colors. Socinianism, Unitarianism, Rationalism, and all forms of separatistic fanaticism are merely a tasteless re-hash of old heresies—a feast of dry bones gathered in the valley of the slain. "Little children—even now are there many anti-Christa."

2. On account of the relation of Christ and the Church, as Head and Body, our views of the Church will grow by necessity out of our views of Christ's person. Hence we have the churchly and unchurchly systems.

The churchly teaches, that the life and grace of Christ, the Head, comes to us, the members, through the Church, which is His Body—the home of the Holy Ghost—the bearer of grace—the mother of saints. It teaches that the

Church is, in order, before saints, even as a body is before its members, and a mother before her children. It teaches that no one comes to Christ save through her—that we are born again, not out of her and to her, but in her and from her.

The unchurchly teaches that individual salvation begins either in the divine or human will, operating outside of the Church, will on will, without the intervention of the Church.* It teaches, that the Church is a result of faith instead of an object of faith—that Christians are first, and they organize the Church—that the Holy Ghost is operative outside of the Church, by direct afflatus, and for her, instead of through the Church and from her—that it is *our* instrumentality instead of *God's* organ—that it is as a granary rather than as a garden—that we need not the Church to bring us to Christ, but only to keep us safely when we have come to him.

As to which of these systems is the scriptural one, there can be no hesitation or doubt. To place a mother after her children is ridiculous. The Church is never set forth in any other way, than as a bosom of generating and nurturing powers—bringing forth her own results. "Of Zion it shall be said, This and that man was born in her." Ps. 87: 5. The saints are her sons and daughters. Mark 4: 26-29. The Church is producing—a vineyard, a garden, a field, a family. That is a venerable and anointed truth: He that hath not the Church for his mother, hath not God for his father.

3. Our views of the Church form our views of the sacraments. Hence we have the sacramental and unsacramental systems. The sacraments, being the organs of the Church,—the first and deepest factors of her power and grace in the hands of the ministry,—must partake of her generating and nurturing power, and hold the same relation to Christ, on the one hand, and men on the other, as the Church itself.

The sacramental system teaches that these holy institu-

Dr. Hodge on Ephesians, pp. 245, 246.

tions are sacramental and not sacrificial—acts from Christ to man and not from man to Christ—that they are gracious acts which he does to us, and not merely grateful acts which we do to Him—that we come to them to receive, not merely to give—that they are the bearers of grace to the believer, and not merely the expressions of love and obedience on the part of saints—means of grace first, and then means of gratitude; not like the types of Judaism, pointing to a Christ to come elsewhere, but the gracious substance of a Christ come and present—not merely memorials of an absent Saviour, but organs of a present one; not Saviours, it is true, but saving.

The other system resolves the efficacy of sacraments into the subjective act of faith—making the receiving organ in man greater than the imparting organ of the Church. It glorifies the word to the disparagement of the sacraments. It glorifies what it calls the Spirit's work, to the disparagement of Christ's positive institutions. Instead of teaching, that the Spirit carries out Christ's work, by taking of His, and showing it to us, they make Christ's institutions carry out the Spirit's work. They make the Spirit "speak of Himself," and not "that which he hears"—placing the work of regeneration, sanctification, and salvation into the Spirit's independent hands, while the institutions of Christ are only to be reached in the course of the process, and to be observed as expressions of gratitude for what has been done. This system effects the new-birth by the Spirit without the water—imparts the renewing of the Holy Ghost without the washing of regeneration—puts on Christ without being baptized into Christ—rises with him without having been buried with him—grows with him without having been planted with him—proposes to carry the struggling spirit over the tumultuous sea of the world's chaotic ruin without the ark, "the like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us."

Which of these views is scripturally correct, is at once plain. The sacraments are set forth as the acts of the Church to men—the Church gives, men receive. "*Be*

baptized." "*Take, eat—broken for you.*" The Holy Ghost is given upon baptism—always following the act, and not preceding it. John 3: 5. Acts 2: 38. Acts 19: 1-6. Titus 3: 5.* All that we need is promised, as consequent on the sacrament—remission of sins, regeneration, nourishment, and eternal life, and resurrection. Acts 2: 38. John 6.

4. Our views of the Church and sacraments mould our views of Christian nurture. If the Church is a mother, her nurturing and nourishing must differ from that which can find place, if she is merely an asylum for orphans gathered out of the world. Hence we have the educational system, and the fanatical.

The educational proceeds upon the ground that baptism is a true transfer from nature into grace—a real planting into him, so that Christ is "put on." The baptized one is in the position of a seed in good ground—a Christian by separation and in possibility, having now the basis for a new life, and a warrant for using all the means for growing up into Christ to full stature.

Hence all the nurture is on the basis of grace, not on the basis of nature. It is a nurture in the Church, not out of it; and the result is a growth *in* grace, not *into* it. The

* We are aware of the difficulties created in some minds, in the way of objection to what is here presented, by the passages Acts 10: 44-48. 11: 15. But it ought to be remembered, first of all, that it is a mere trifling with the word of God thus to array Scripture against Scripture. There must be a harmony to the divine record. It is evident, moreover, that the passages referred to in the text, professedly and directly point out the relation of Baptism and the Holy Ghost, and present the normal order. These passages also receive their true meaning clearly, from the historical order which places Christ and his Institutions before the Spirit and His work. The passages brought in by way of objection, may be regarded as showing the extraordinary advent of the Spirit into the outside regions of Gentileism. We may hold that the Holy Spirit's gift is upon baptism, as consequence and completion, in the normal order of redemption, and yet not presume to set limits to the Holy Spirit, which is the Spirit of freedom. As Calvin would say, God is not bound, though we are. To us the Holy Ghost is only promised upon our submitting to baptism; and whoever expects His full gift without it or before it, is guilty of a presumption which will meet with a deserved disappointment and reproof. Hence the dreadful heresy which rejects Infant Baptism; and that kindred one which fanatically supposes itself to perform all its regenerations by the Spirit alone—flatly and systematically contradicting our Saviour's solemn instructions to Nicodemus.

whole life from baptism on, in the family, the school, the Church, is to be the unbroken growth of a Christian. The person becomes a Christian in his baptism, and his experiences afterward are not to be those of transition, but of advance—his life is to change, not in kind, but in degree.

The other system trains its children—so far as it attaches any importance to it—not as Christians, but as sinners. Though they may be baptized, the parent is taught to fear believing that the birth of water may be accompanied by the birth of the Spirit. Though God has joined the water and the Spirit, they train them up to regard themselves as enemies of God, and instruct them to seek a spiritual birth by a revolution, to come later in life, and to have no necessary connection with Baptism. Though the parents and the Church have professed faith in their behalf, and they have received what the Scripture calls the “washing of regeneration” and the “putting on of Christ,” yet they are instructed that they are unregenerate, unbelieving, impenitent, and children of wrath. Why then is infant baptism retained? It is retained loosely, and as a mere traditional form. It is looked upon with doubt and indifference—it is first practically neglected, and then theoretical ly cast out.

Where this false system prevails, there is no true Christian nurture possible. There may be attempts at *education*—drawing out the elements of nature as in Unitarianism and other forms of Rationalism. There may be *training*—an outward regulation of the child's life by the rules of morality. There may be *instruction*—a building up of religious truths and doctrines in the mind and memory. But NURTURE is that warm power of life which underlies all these, as mother and home underlie and surround the child. Where this false system prevails, instead of moisture beneath and around plants, and sun and dew upon them, there will be darkness to make them monstrous, cold neglect to chill and dwarf them, and storms to rend and destroy. Nurture is only possible in the garden of the Lord, not upon the world's uncovenanted and ungracious com-

mons. Only those who are born can be nurtured. The Church system secures for its children the birth of water and the Holy Ghost—becomes to them that are born a true mother—and of those whom she finds in the Saviour's arms, and sees that He blesses them, she says, I will bless them too—and warming them into life and love, they pass through the family, the school, the Church, into heaven.

It is the system of religion which we have delineated, that underlies the Heidelberg Catechism, and reigns in the genius of the German Reformed Church in its true original spirit. Some illustrations of this fact shall finish our present discussion.

1. That this system underlies the Heidelberg Catechism is seen in its general arrangement. It is divided into three parts—the first is to effect our penitence; the second our deliverance; the third our gratitude. It places the Church and the sacraments in the Second Part, as factors by which our deliverance is to be effected. The un-churchly system would place them in the Third Part—teaching, as it does, that union with the Church is to follow deliverance, and the sacraments are to be attended to only as expressions of gratitude by one who has been delivered.

2. That the Church system underlies the Catechism is seen from the position which it gives to the Creed. It recognizes the Apostle's Creed as *THE* Creed. It allows no other that conflicts with it. The Reformers did not regard the movement in which they were engaged as a revolution, or a reconstruction, but as a Reformation, the development of a substance which had suffered oppression and limitation. Their work was "the disengaging from its coverings or folds, that which lay before wrapped up and concealed under them, a bringing to birth of that which lay in embryo, creating nothing new, and, certainly, inventing nothing contrary to, or destructive of, the original germ which it professes to develop." Thus, doctrinally, the heart, and the blood, and the nerves of the Reformation were all at hand in the existing Creed, whose steady living voice sounded down through all ages; and the Reformers

could as easily have thought of killing their own mothers as destroying the Creed—as easily of putting out a mother's eye, or cutting off her right hand, as eliminating any one of its articles, even that tormentor before its time of all un-churchly minds: "He descended into hell."

This spirit of the Reformation located the Creed in the heart of the Heidelberg Catechism. All that goes before it, leads to it; all that follows after it, grows out of it by logical and theological necessity. This Creed rests in Christ, and Christ lives in it. It rests in the Church, and the Church speaks and breathes in it. He that is in the Church believes it, and he that is out of the Church cannot believe it. He that believes in the Church understands it, and he that does not believe in the Church cannot understand it. In its light do we see light; and he that will do its will shall know the doctrine.

The Heidelberg Catechism was not made by Ursinus and Olevianus *direct* from the Bible, though every word it teaches is confirmed from the Bible. If they had made it direct from the Bible it would contain nothing but their views of what the Bible teaches; and if, in that way, Servetus, or Socinus, or Wesley, or Campbell, or Albright, had made it, it would have contained their views of what the Bible teaches. They did not put their own sense into the Bible and then take it out again and put it into the Catechism, but they put the sense of the Church, as embodied in the Creed, into the Bible; and in the life, and spirit, and sense of both, they framed the Catechism.

Those who stand outside of the Church system may say, they learned the sense of the Scripture from the Spirit. But this is a seducing siren thought. What Spirit? They answer, of course, the Holy Spirit! But where is the Holy Spirit, except in the Church—as it is in the Creed? But it is also given to Christians. Right—but not to Christians out of the Church, but to Christians in it. The Spirit speaks through the Church first, then through individual Christians.

The truth lies in the Scriptures, like botany lies in the

vegetable kingdom; and while all men have a right to go forth directly into the fields to admire plants and flowers, to enjoy their perfume and their fruit, he that would construct a systematic botany, except he be a presumptuous man, will approach the vegetable kingdom not directly, but through the results of what has been done. Should he go forth directly and alone, he will be just as likely, yea, far more likely, to construct some past exploded system, as a true one. Or, to use another illustration, he that goes directly, with no means but his own opinions, into the Bible to gather materials for his Creed, resembles one who should go forth into the clover fields to gather a swarm of bees. He may gather enough to make a swarm, and put them together into a hive; but will he have a swarm, because he has bees, and enough of them to make a swarm? Will they have adherence? Will they work as a swarm? Will they remain with him? The forced and foolish union will rather cause them to sting one another, and to sting him; and very soon he will have an empty hive, with neither bees nor honey. "Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing, see not; and hearing, hear not; neither do they understand." There is a mystic something—call it what we may—that is deeper and stronger than individual bees, constituting the swarm, and than our power over them; so there is a power belonging to, and constituting the Church, the kingdom of Christ, deeper and stronger than all individual wisdom and skill; and as bees act only properly in the swarm, so men are only right in this mystical constitution and bosom of powers. The Catechism is the product of such a mystic life, and speaks from it, and this is its claim to be heard. The Creed furnishes the *FACTS*, and these are the facts of our Saviour's life, the only true God, born, suffering, dying, triumphing over death and hell, rising, ascending, reigning, giving the Spirit, constituting the Church, the communion of saints, effecting the forgiveness of sins, and triumphing for all saints in their resurrection and eternal glorification in heaven—these facts are the basis of all its doctrines, as

interpretations of the Holy Scriptures. Thus the whole Catechism rests in the Creed, and through the Creed in the Church, and through the Church in the Spirit, and through the Spirit in Christ, who is the Head over all.

Thus the Catechism, in its very position and construction, excludes every individual interpretation of the Scriptures, except the individual interpreter stands first in its bosom and life, and so also in the bosom and life of the Church.

But not only in spirit and position does the Catechism forbid issues to be raised outside of the Creed and independent of it, but it does so in direct teachings. "*Ques. 12.* What is then necessary for a Christian to believe? *Ans.* All things promised us in the Gospel;"—who is to say what it is that the Gospel teaches? every individual Christian?—"which the articles of our catholic undoubted Christian faith briefly teach us." Here is the teacher. From the Creed we must learn the substance of "all things promised us in the Gospel." Then *Ques. 23:* "What are these articles?" The Creed. Here all individual opinion of the teachings of the Scripture is subordinated to the Creed. Not the Scripture is subordinated—for that is the norm of the Creed itself, the fountain of all truth—but all individual interpretations of the Scripture are subordinated. Even as the government does not allow every individual to appeal for himself to the original elements and sources of law, but binds all to the national code as administered through properly constituted governmental organs, so the Catechism binds our faith to the Creed, and through it to the Scriptures. The Scriptures have been the rule of faith to the Church and the Creed; the Church and Creed are a rule of faith to us. So, consistently as the Catechism has introduced the Creed, does it also close its deductions from it in the 59th Question. "But what doth it profit thee now that thou believest all this? *Ans.* That I am righteous in Christ before God, and an heir of eternal life." To believe the facts of the Creed truly, to live in their life, to be transformed by their power—or the power of Jesus

Christ and the Spirit in and through them—to triumph in their grace, is eternal life.

That this is the true sense, genius, spirit, and life of the Catechism is beyond question. That the Reformed Church has so understood and held it, is testified by every Reformer, and by every Reformed theologian that has truly spoken from her bosom, and in the spirit of her symbols, from the first voice to the last. Every voice that has given another sound has done so either by virtue of that tolerance which has distinguished her catholic spirit, or as the farewell voice of some sect hero that has broken from her communion. Every other voice is a war-cry, the signal, first of heresy, and then of schism.

Never have we seen this position of the Reformed Church more strongly, clearly, and beautifully exhibited and proclaimed, than is done symbolically on the title-page of an old copy of the Palatinate Heidelberg Catechism. There stands a man holding up a scroll in one hand, which is the Heidelberg Catechism, pointing to an open Bible that lies upon a desk before him with the other hand, while upon the scroll is written, "*Nach dieser Regel suchet in der Schrift*"—that is, "according to *this rule* search the Scriptures." Here is the true churchly position of the Catechism so plainly exhibited that he who runs may read. Let such as cannot read study painting.

3. The doctrine of the keys which the Catechism teaches, is only consistent in the Church system. What does the doctrine of the keys claim? Merely to apply certain rules of discipline to such as violate such rules, as in a voluntary society? No; it claims the power of judging. It claims its acts of exclusion to be God's acts, "whereby they are excluded from the Christian Church, and by God himself from the kingdom of Christ"—Ques. 85—not merely from a certain society or congregation. It also claims the right of excluding persons for maintaining certain "*doctrines*," as well as "*practices*." Ques. 85. How is this a justifiable claim except upon the principle that the Church is a power above men, to which they, not only in their lives,

but in their faith must be submissive. While it proposes to judge according to the Scriptures, it claims the interpretation of those Scriptures as its own prerogative; and allows no individual protests, professedly based on Scripture by the protestor. In this light does the Catechism interpret the passages in God's word in regard to "opening" and "shutting," "binding," and loosing," "remitting" and "retaining."

4. It recognizes the Church system as underlying it when it speaks to the baptized catechumens as Christians, and instructs them to answer as Christians. This, those who speak out of another element call a fault—if not an error and an evil. "It teaches them to speak as hypocrites—they are made to say what is not true." This very objection shows how opposite to that of the Catechism is the system in which the objector stands; and how entirely he fails to see that profound basis which underlies the Catechism.

This peculiarity is not incidental, but fundamental to the system of the Catechism. It rests upon the fact that the instructed occupy a gracious position since their baptism—that they are God's children in a higher sense than ever an Israelite was by circumcision—that they stand in the covenant of grace. As the offspring of believing parents, they had a birth-right to baptism; and being baptized, they have a covenant right, signed and sealed, to claim all that God ever promised to his own. God is their God. Christ is their Saviour; for they have been baptized into Him by his command. The Holy Ghost is their Sanctifier, and He was given them in baptism.

They are taught that grace is theirs, and they are now taught to keep and confirm it by a heartfelt and sincere confession. The very words, by which they are at once to learn what it is, and by which they are to confess and claim it as their own, are placed into their mouths. Thus a faithful mother calls her children to lip after her the precious words of faith, dedication, and devotion. She says to them: "So claim and profess; you cease only to be a Christian

when you refuse so to claim and profess." She says: "Grow up into Christ from your present position—your danger all lies in your drawing back from it." Let not the Church be alarmed by the fear of making her children hypocrites, as long as they willingly and with seriousness lisp the faith after her. So the eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her wings. Or as the poet has so beautifully paraphrased the same sentiment:

And, as a bird each fond endearment tries
To tempt its new-fledged offspring to the skies,
She tries each art, reproves each dull delay,
Allures to brighter worlds, and leads the way.

5. Another peculiarity of the Catechism which has its ground in the churchly system, is the use which it makes of the law. It is, and has been, a cause of wonder to some, that though the First Part of the Catechism is to lead to a knowledge of sin, and that knowledge of sin is said to be by the law, yet the law is not there introduced; but is reserved to the Third Part. This has a deep significance. The unchurchly system would have put the law in the First Part; because it uses the law before grace and unto it, like Judaism in its spirit of bondage.

Grace is older than the law, and goes before it. The law is in its proper position only when it confronts those in grace. Even to those who stood around Sinai, when it was first given, God first says: "*I am the Lord thy God.*" Hence the commandments are negative,—"*go not away!*" The use of the law is to be reached as a result of grace. It can only be received in the hands of a mediator.

But is not the law to be used for purposes of penitence? Yea, as it is presented in the First Part, in its substance, which is love. In this form it is the new commandment of Christ. Those in grace by position are to be led into grace by full possession—their possibility is to be actualized. This is to be done, first of all by awakening them to penitence. The true ground of penitence is God's love, and our sense of defect in responding to that love. "The

goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance"—the law in the light of God's love. The law in its essence, which is love. Penitence is a filial, not a slavish sorrow. It does not grow out of terror, but out of sweetly dawning mercy. It is connected with the past in which God's love is seen; not with the future where fear arises in view of the consequences of sin. It is the obedience of love with which the Catechism confronts us in its first part. The Catechumen is to be brought to the consciousness that, sinful as he may have been, a series and a support of mercies have been beneath and around him since his birth—born into Christian arms, planted into Christ and grace in infancy, nurtured by holy surroundings, challenged now by still greater favors held out and offered by the Church; and now, as these moving facts of mercy are brought to view, he feels that all this love has not begotten love in return! He feels, too, that his only hope now is in that same mercy, in the bosom of which he has all along rested and been borne, and in the acceptance of what is now still farther offered and urged—verily, it is the sense of his disobedience to this heavenly vision that melts his heart into true penitential sorrow, gratitude and love. For in the language of one of the Reformers, to "repent aright is nothing else than a return to our baptism from which we have fallen."

Thus, also, it will be seen at once, that the theory of repentance which rests in, and grows from, the Church system, is alone the true evangelical one; and that that which is produced outside of it is a mere slavish terror and alarm, which ends in folly. It has driven many into that sorrow of the world which worketh death. The type of the penitence of love, is Mary at the feet of Jesus, washing his feet with her tears and wiping them with her hair, and then going and loving much. The type of the penitence of fear, is the children of Israel quailing and quaking in dread and terror around the mountain of Sinai, and then going and making a golden calf.

6. That the Church system underlies the Catechism is seen in its peculiar doctrinal position, as it stands related

to Calvinism on the one hand and Arminianism on the other.

Its peculiar spirit on this point is well known. It has been charged, on the one side, of being secretly Calvinistic, and on the other, of being quietly Arminian; and from both sides the cry has been rung into our ears: "Art thou for us, or for our adversaries!" It has only silently held its sword, and answered, "Nay; but as the captain of the host of the Lord am I come." Josh. 5: 13, 14. It is both, and neither; or, in other words, it is the truth of both.*

Calvinism finds the first, and deepest, and constant ground of salvation in the abstract eternal decree of predestination—and finds it only for a portion of the race. Before all worlds—so the theory goes—this decree went out, and, anticipating history, selected in the fallen race an elect number to life. Then to save these, Christ was sent, the Church instituted, the Holy Ghost given, and all the means of grace ordained. Thus, the incarnation, the Church, the Spirit's work, and all the divine manifestations and appliances appear as a mighty parenthesis, running through the whole mediatorial history, to meet the decree which went out, not through this line of history, but by anticipation, some other way. Thus, in the case of the elect, the decree is the ground of salvation, and Christ a mere means. "There is a federal union with Christ which is antecedent to all actual union, and the *source* of it," says one.† Again: "He died for them *on condition* that they should be the sons of God, restored to their Father's family and reinstated in all the privileges of this divine relationship."‡ Thus the decretal contract is the *source*, and

* It is worthy of profound consideration, that the Heidelberg Catechism, which has always ruled the heart, spirit, and body of the Reformed side of the Reformation, has no prototype in any of the Reformers. Zwingli and Calvin can say, it is not of me. It has the suavity but not the compromising spirit of Melancthon. It has nothing of the dashing terror of Luther. What is stranger than all, it is farthest possible removed from the mechanical scholasticism, and rigid logic, of Ursinus, its principal author. Though it has the warm, practical, sacred, poetical fervor of Olevianus, it has none of his fire and flame. It is greater than Reformers. It is purer and sounder than theologians.

† Dr. Hodge on Ephesians, p. 31. ‡ Idem. p. 36.

the death of Christ the *condition* of salvation. This scheme the Church system cannot receive—with it the Catechism does not coalesce—it came not in by the Reformation, but has climbed in some other way. The Church system finds the source of salvation in Christ—not merely the means and condition. He is older than all decrees. The decree is in Him, and from Him : not He in it, and for it. In God, decree and act—will and actualization are one, and not sundered by time. In time only—the element of our weakness—does decree precede and act follow—this is all only true in created intelligences, who act in the limitations of time and space. In reference to God, who exists as “an eternal now,” out of time, and acts in it, the decree is, *to us*, never before history, but in it as its starting moving factor. All his purposes, actualize themselves in, and do not stand in front, of history, of Christ, of the Church, of saints. It is not necessary that the eternal source of all should anticipate himself. To plan ahead, in our human conceptions of it, implies limitation, weakness, fear of defeat. God unfolds his will, that evolution is history, and in that history, as its genus and life, is His present will—and that is his decree—purpose, and power, and act, in one.

Thus Christ was the chosen. In him moved the decree. In the Church, which is his body, it unfolds its power and glorious grace. In the sacraments it makes “election sure.” Baptism is the decree actualized in time—the only election with which we have practically any thing to do. It is the hand which is the bearer of the divine election—its acceptance is the covenant of election—its rejection is reprobation. On this pivot hangs the peril. This is the hinge on which the disciples were to suspend the “pain of damnation.” “Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to *every* creature, *he* that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, *he* that believeth not shall be damned.”

The system of Calvinism is as if we should suspend a number of apples in the air, and then make the tree grow up to them, and apprehend them. The Church system, is

as the natural order, in which the apples appear as the end and result of its development. The soul whom the Church has reached and apprehended by baptism is elect—and was not elect before; yet now elected only “to be a saint”—“predestinated unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ”—chosen in him “that we should be holy.” In baptism the election begins in fact, but is not finished. In it is a possibility of salvation, not an actuality. “For we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end.”*

Hence the Catechism also speaks the language of an Arminian; yet not from the Arminian basis, but from the Church basis. Those to whom it speaks are in grace—in the beginning of it, as it lies in baptism, and the Spirit given in that sacrament. They, accordingly, have ability: not, however, the ability of nature, but the ability of grace. Their wills have power of right activity, because they stand and move in a bosom of grace. Their activity is not from a point out of grace reaching after that which they have not; but an activity in grace holding fast in their new position,—into which a divine sacramental act has translated them,—to the power and grace which bear them.

Thus the Church system places the ground of salvation, not with Calvinism, in the abstract divine decree, but in the divine will mercifully apprehending us in Christ and

* Very properly is the distinction made between the terms *election* and *predestination*. Election is a taking up into—predestination is a determining unto. Election applies to such as are assumed into the Church—predestination to the merciful purpose of God toward those who yet stand without. The first applies to those who have submitted, the second applies to all. Thus Paul, in Eph. 1: 4, 5, 6. “According as he hath chosen (elected) us in him, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the Beloved.” So in the 11th and 12th verses: “Being predestinated—that we should be,” &c. Thus predestination is a purpose that bestows a privilege to a position: Election, the assuming act into that position in the case of all who believe and submit. This distinction avoids that terrible alternative of admitting a predestination unto reprobation. The decree of reprobation is *man's own decree*—not God's. See 1 Cor. 9: 27. Rom. 1: 28. 2 Tim. 3: 8. Titus 1: 16. 2 Cor. 13: 6, 7. See especially the scriptural and classical use of *deceper* and *deceper*.

the Church. Nor yet does it find the true ground, with Arminianism, in the human purpose, which seeks, by the aid of Christ and the Church, to attain to salvation by its own power of self-determination. Both these are aside of the truth. The one taking as its fulcrum the divine will, working outside of the incarnation and its history; the other taking as its fulcrum the human will, outside of a position of grace. Both these dishonor Christ and the Church, by making them mere means, instead of sources, of grace. That is the most reprehensible of all heresies which degrades Christ to a mere means of grace.

The Church system makes salvation wholly of grace; but not grace hanging over man in dark, fatal, enigmatical abstraction, but grace in its merciful and eternal history in Christ, in the Church, and in all who suffer themselves to be incorporated in her grace of baptism to be renewed by her Spirit, and to be nurtured in her bosom of saving powers.

The Church system maintains also, with Arminianism, full freedom of the human will, saying: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you." "He that believeth"—not believeth that he is elected or regenerated, but believeth that Christ and the Church can and will make him so,— "and is baptized"—or having been baptized, will fall back upon that covenant, as the full adequate power and warrant of grace and salvation to him, putting himself under her holy nurture, receiving all things that the Church teaches him to observe—he that so believes and so obeys—"shall be saved:" and "he that believeth not shall be damned." "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name."

On this Church ground, as in the Catechism, are the contradictions of Calvinism and Arminianism reconciled, and their truth retained; for both clearly lie in the Scriptures. As in Christ, the Incarnate God, the divine and human are one: so in the Church, which in like manner unites the divine and human, the divine and human wills

are made one. In Jerusalem, which is above, man is free—in her the free are born—in her all freedom begins and is perfected. In her the divine will is not a dark power hanging in unseen fatality over the human spirit, but the tender melting will of a mother; and in her the human will is not a bond-slave, unnerved by terror, but a child which kindles up under the smiles which cheer and bless it, believes and lives. Here is harmony between man and God, nature and grace—the human and the divine will—here is the vision of peace—here must end—if it ever ends in the Church militant—this conflict of ages.

What a touch-stone does the whole subject furnish by which to detect any tendencies of an unchurchly and downward character in the Reformed Church to which it has been disposed too easily to yield. What a test by which may be known, in the Reformed communion, the insidious workings of the spirit of a system not its own—not its own by history or standard, nor its own by spirit and genius, nor its own by the Scriptures of truth—let it not be made its own by a quiet unfaithful surrender of the better, and a blind choice of the worse. Let not the Reformed Church be allured by smiles, or frightened by frowns to bow its neck to strange tribute. Shall the anointed authority and majesty of its venerable history be pronounced a lie at the bidding of a Babel cry of impotent individualism? Shall it suffer its solid educational system to be evaporated in the frothy, vapory boilings of an arrogant fanaticism? Shall it exchange its blessed sacramental system for the impotent spasmodic strugglings of private feeling and private faith? Shall it choose the suicide of falling from the Church system upon the opinions and vain promises of individual theological schemings and experiments? Our holiest instincts, our most precious memories, our theological history, and our venerated symbols, say: No.

The Reformed Church in America has prospered in proportion as it has been true to its own proper position and genius. The spirit which has shown itself worthy of receiving a greater crowd of martyr witnesses since the Re-

formers than all Protestant denominations together, will not now suffer it to sell its birth-right at the bid of dictation, misrepresentation and abuse. When its self-constituted guardians have protested their last on the subject of its Puseyism and Romanism, it will still say, as by the mouth of all the Reformers, and in unison with the voice of all Christian ages: The Church is our mother—the Creed is our faith—and whatever is catholic shall teach us. He that denies the Church is an infidel—he that denies the Creed is a heretic—and they that will not bow reverently to the instructions of the solemn Past, both individuals and sects, have sinned against the spirit of the fifth commandment, nor shall their days be long in the land which the Lord their God hath given them.

Lancaster, Pa.

H. H.

ART. V.—SKETCHES OF A TRAVELER FROM GREECE, CONSTANTINOPLE, ASIA MINOR, SYRIA AND PALESTINE.

VII. MY TRAVELS IN PELOPONNESUS.

II. SPARTA. (CONTINUATION.)

Site of ancient Sparta—Castle Hill—Theatre—Temples—Inscriptions—Roman Amphitheatre—Issorion—Aphrodision—Kolona—Dorian, Roman, Byzantine Ruins—Rural life of the Spartans—Sanctuary of Minerva—Athena Ergane—Market-place—Monument of Leonidas—Skias—Doric Museum—Platanistas—Dromas—Sepulchres of the Agida—Altar of Diana Orthia—Devastation of Abbé Fourmont—Modern Sparta—Silk spinnery—Environs—Amyklai—Therapne—Menelaion—Vaults at Vaseó—Doric Bridge—Rise and Glory—Decline and Fall—Roman Conquest—Mountaineers of Mani.

ATHENS may at present be considered as the starting-point of every traveler in the Levant. Hence we meet with frequent descriptions of that city, its antiquities and modern development, in every work on Eastern travels, while the artists furnish us with pictures of its monuments and scenery.

Different are the relations with regard to Sparta. Situated far away beyond the mountains, and difficult of access, it is seldom visited; and so little curiosity has hitherto been excited about the old rival of Athens, that it may not be generally known that a description of the valley of the Eurotus embraces not one, but four or five cities of the name of Sparta or Lakedaimon—all at different periods situated on the banks of that river or in its immediate neighborhood, and about every one of which we may relate some historical facts and describe interesting extant

monuments. The first of these is the ancient Achaian capital of King Menelaos, at Therapne, opposite to Sparta; the second, the extensive Dorian city of that name; the third, the smaller but strongly-fortified Byzantine town of Lakedaimonia, during the middle ages situated on the central hills of the old city. The fourth, is the more modern town and castle, which the fourth prince of Achaia, William of Villehardouin, built at the base of Mount Taygetos, in 1250, called Misithrás or Misthrá by the Franks, but Sparta by the Byzantines. This last became the capital of the Turks: it was, therefore, almost entirely destroyed by the Mainots at the outbreak of the war of independence in 1821, and though somewhat restored since, is at present yielding in rank, population, and prosperity to the fifth Sparta, the flourishing Amaliapolis, which, under the auspices of king Otho, has now risen on the southern hills of Old Sparta, near the western bank of the Eurotas.

Thus with the annals of history in our hands, and the scanty but authentic and precious remains before us, from different ages, Achaian, Dorian, Roman, Byzantine, Frankish, Othoman and Romaic—we may perhaps succeed in tracing the outlines of that celebrated city through all her vicissitudes, her rise and victorious sway, her decline and overthrow, her resurrection and slow but steady modern development, from old Menelaos, the king, and Lykurgos, the law-giver, down to the present day, through a course of more than thirty centuries!

But will our skeptical modern historians assent to this? Will they not with an incredulous smile, inquire if we can in all reality exhibit ante-Dorian monuments, proving the historical existence of the Pelopidæ in the distant era of the Trojan war, which by the distinguished Mr. Grote is considered as all poetry and fiction?

On the morning after our arrival at Misthrá, we prepared to start for the ruins of Sparta. Papa Oikonomides, our landlord, who was both curate and *didaskalos* or teacher, at the Hellenic school of the town, offered to give his boys another holiday, in order to be our guide, perhaps

with the *arrièrepensée* of having his share of the good dinner in the hospitable house of Mr. Levendis, the governor of the province of Lakedaimon, who was an old acquaintance of ours from Athens.

The distance between Misthrá and the site of ancient Sparta is four miles, or an hour's ride, through a fertile and beautiful plain, covered with forest which presents a varied prospect of orange, lemon, and mulberry groves. The majestic trees are interlaced with wild vines and luxuriant ivy hanging in festoons from tree to tree, and disclosing charming vistas to the blue mountains in the distance, whose forms and hues vary at every turn of the road.

We soon crossed a brisk perennial torrent that descends from Mount Taygetos and is called Trypiotiko, the ancient Tiasa, and leaving the woods behind us, we rode forward upon the more open plain toward the village of Magula. Here our attention was drawn toward numerous masses of ruins that covered the hills in front. A Roman aqueduct on a double range of arches is seen on the north; churches, chapels, massy brick buildings, are scattered along the plain and the base of the hills which separated us from the Eurotas; while the central hill itself is crowned along its summit with crumbling walls and towers of a city. All this seemed very astonishing to us at the first sight, from the earlier impression left us by the descriptions of travelers, of the few and insignificant relics to be found on the site of Sparta.

"*Ιδου την Σπάρτην!* Here we have Sparta, Affendi!" said the schoolmaster. "Some modern ruins certainly, but probably none of the Dorian city," we replied. But lo! a few paces forward, and all at once the immense blocks of the Dorian theatre made their appearance on the south side of the principal hill. "Here then lies the city of Lykurgos:

"Sparta, Sparta, why in slumbers?
Why in lethargy so deep?
Rouse thyself, thy friend awaken,
Glorious Athens from her sleep."

Call to mind thy ancient warrior,
Great Leonidas of old,
Mighty man of fame immortal,
The tremendous and the bold."

We dismounted, and throwing some husks of corn before our horses, which we attached to a tree in a field, we ascended to the theatre situated on the highest hill, some fifty or sixty feet above the plain. The view from there at once embraces the entire circumference of the ancient city, and we were struck with the accuracy of Polybios, who thus describes the site of Sparta:

"The form of the city," says the historian, "is nearly circular, and its circumference forty-eight stades, or six Roman miles. It lies partly in the plain and partly on hills of different height and extension. The river Eurotas runs to the east of the city, and is so deep that it is not fordable during the greater part of the year. The steep and rough Mount Menelaion ascends on the east so close to the river that it leaves only a narrow defile, a quarter of a mile in length, for the passage."*

The hills which occupied the site of ancient Sparta are five in number; the *Aphrodision* on the north, the *Akropolis* on which we stand, south of the former; the *Issorion* eastward, projecting steeply toward the bank of the river; and at a greater distance on the south, the fourth hill, *Kolona*, which runs with a precipitous flank along the Eurotas, and sinking steeply down on the rivulet Tiasa, near its junction with the Eurotas, forms a fifth group of low mounds—the *Diktynnaion* sloping off westward on the plain of Magula. On these southern hillocks lies New-Sparta, the present capital.

The prospect from the upper range of the theatre is the grandest and most beautiful the imagination can conceive. It combines the sublime magnificence of the Alpine valleys of Switzerland with the brilliant sky and the vigorous and varied vegetation of Italy. All the plains and all the mountains we have seen—with the exception perhaps of Mount

* Polybii Hist. V. 24.

Lebanon—are surpassed in the variety of their combinations and the beauty of their outlines by the plain of Sparta and the snow-capped Mount Taygetos.†

On the north, beyond the swelling hills on which we are standing we have a prominent branch or bluff of Taygetos, forming the northern defile on the Eurotas, and beyond the river, the towering summit of the Thornax.

On the east, the green meadows, on the banks of the silvery stream, shaded along its course by thickets of laurels, myrtle, and oleander; and beyond it, the steep, naked flanks of the Menelaion range, which, by its fiery red, orange, and violet hues, forms a pleasant contrast to the fresh, grassy banks at its base—and the distant blue peaks of Mount Parion, soaring proudly over its flat and even summit.

On the west, beyond the mulberry and olive-groves, in their variety of pale, silvery, and bright-green tints, interspersed with sombre cypresses—and open glades, vineyards, or maize-fields, with chapels and cottages—rise the masses of Taygetos, with its wonderfully picturesque, abrupt flanks, its deep, rocky gorges, its fertile table-lands and bleak stony peaks or cupolas, forming an immense undulating barrier, 7500 feet above the sea, and extending south as far as the eye can reach. The table-lands, raised high above the steep sides of the mountain, are, like the upper regions of the valley of Inspruck in Tyrol, cultivated with wheat, corn, and fruits, and occupied by many villages called *Klephto-choria*, or robber-hamlets, which are distinctly seen at a great distance from the plain below. On a high conical hill we discover the Castle of Misthrás and the town, with its suburbs of Pandeimoná and Paróra embosomed in gardens extending along its base.

Turning south, in front of the theatre, we have cultiva-

† Travelers generally find a great resemblance between the valley of Misthrás and the celebrated Vega of Granada in Andalusia, where the Sierra Nevada is said to present the same precipitous boldness and grandeur as the Taygetos, and the woody plain a similar almost tropical luxuriance with Lakonia, while Misthrás with her towering Gothic castle and far-straggling suburbs in the distance, can be compared to royal Granada with her Albaycín and Alhambra. Happy he who has seen both!

ted fields interspersed with mulberry and olive trees, beyond which at a distance of half a mile on the low southern hills of ancient Sparta, appears the modern town of Amaliapolis, or the city of Queen Amelia, with its white houses, towering church, and government buildings. Farther on, the eye follows the course of the torrent Tiasa to its junction with the Eurotas; beyond we distinguish the more distant hills and tumuli of Therapne and Amyklai; and ranging down the valley of Hollow Lakonia, over waving forests, our perspective terminates with the high wood-clad Bardounian hills, running east of Taygetos toward the lower Eurotas and cutting off our view from the Lakonian gulf and the open sea.

Such is the panorama of the valley of Lakonia, seen here from the brow of the ruinous theatre; such it was in remote antiquity, when Lykurgos, under the influence of the harmony and beauty of this sublime scenery, in deep and silent meditation laid the foundation of his warlike republic; such it was, when the armies of Sparta, returning from distant glorious campaigns, in their glittering panoply, and surrounded by their rejoicing wives and ruddy children, celebrated thanksgivings before the Brazen Temple of the giver of victory. How different then from now!

The northern-most hill, the Aphrodision, steep and almost perpendicular, forms a strong counter-fort toward the Eurotas. It is separated from the still larger central hill by a deep dell, or artificial avenue, which in two terraces leads to its upper platform. This latter hill is the Akropolis of Sparta—not, as that of Athens, Argos, Corinth, and other Greek cities, a strong fortress situated on a high, impregnable rock; but only a hill, containing the principal temples and sanctuaries of the Spartans, surrounded by their five camps or villages as a common centre. It is the largest and highest hill on the site of the ancient city, and the only one which could have been used for such a purpose. It is strewed all over with ruins of baths, aqueducts, dwelling-houses, fragments of marbles and pottery, and on

the south side stands excavated in its flank—the most remarkable monument of Doric Sparta—the great theatre.*

On the east, again separated by a deep, perhaps artificial passage, rises another precipitous hill, the ancient Issorion, the somewhat lower continuation of which, the Kolona, forms a steep bank toward the river, running southward for more than a mile, until its junction with the torrent Tiasa, where the hills turn west and slope off toward the plain.

And here we shall draw the attention of the reader to an important fact, which, in a remarkable manner, explains the history of Sparta—that the city, although open and not defended by walls, was yet sufficiently fortified by nature. The entire plateau of Sparta, with its four principal summits, forms a steep front line toward the banks of the Eurotas, being protected on the north by the bluff ridge already mentioned, as running down from Taygetos toward the river; on the south-east by a line of precipices near the junction of the Tiasa, and on the south by that rivulet flowing in a deep, rocky channel. This long, front line of steep hills, rising to a height of between forty and sixty feet above the level of the river, was occasionally occupied by the Spartan army, and withstood victoriously all the attacks of Epaminondas, the Makedonians and Romans. Thus beaten back, the enemy was obliged to proceed through the narrow defiles of Mount Menelaion, east of Sparta, re-cross the Eurotas, and encamp south of the city on the plain of Amyklai, whence he might direct his assault toward the only exposed part of Sparta—the southwest.

Yet even this side was not entirely unprotected; we still discover the traces of two canals which crossed the plain of Magula, leading the water of the Tiasa eastward to the market-place under the Akropolis, and branching off by

* The building of theatres in the castle-rocks was a generally prevailing custom among the Greeks. Thus we find the theatre of Bacchus and the Odeum of Herodas Attikos, excavated on the southern flank of the Akropolis at Athens, and other similar edifices at Argos, Chaironeia in Boiotia, and other places.

another water-course to the *Plaitanistas*, or low peninsula formed by the junction of the *Tiasa* with the *Eurotas*. It was in that south-western direction, between the canals, that the Spartans, in 272 B. C., at the sudden attack of Pyrrhos, king of Epeiros, drew a ditch eight hundred feet in length by nine in breadth, and six in depth, protected by carriages and barricades, which the Spartan women defended so bravely, that they forced the warlike madman to retire with dishonor. Here, too, and along the steep banks of the *Tiasa*, was afterward (195 B. C.) erected that strong line of walls before which fifty thousand Romans, commanded by Quintius Flamininus, were repulsed, and the noble city thus saved from the humiliation of a Roman occupation.

These city walls, built by the despicable tyrant Nabia, in the year 196 B. C., inclosed the entire circumference of Sparta. They were broken down by Philopoimen, the celebrated president and general of the Achaian Confederation, 188 B. C., but afterward rebuilt a second time by the same Achaians, on the scornful command of Rome, and they existed during the period of the Roman dominion in Greece. At the present day, however, we can only trace their foundations on the southern hills along the river *Tiasa*, and at some places westward through the plain of *Magula*.

Such being the natural locality of Sparta, we shall now give an account of the remaining monuments from the Doric and Roman times.

Some foundations of old buildings are seen on the northern hill, the *Aphrodision*, where stood the Temple of *Aphrodite*, (*Venus*;) others on the *Issorion*. Many heaps of square blocks and marble fragments—daily diminishing—were still lying on the more elevated parts of the southern hill, indicating temples and public buildings mentioned by *Pausanias*. But the principal ruin is the theatre, excavated, as we said, in the south-western corner of the *Akropolis*. The two extremities of its *cavea* or semi-circle are supported by enormous masses of quadrangular stones, and

the *chord* or scene is constructed of brick-work, now mostly destroyed. Some rows of seats still exist, but the greater part have been carried away, and the *orchestra*, or bottom of the semi-circle, in front of the scene, is now occupied by melon-gardens, (*bostania*,) while the plain around is laid out in corn-fields, interspersed with mulberry trees. Each wing of the theatre has about 120 feet in breadth, and the total diameter was 450 feet, which proves that it was the largest theatre in Greece, those of Athens and Megalopolis only excepted. Dramatic exhibitions were prohibited by the severe institutions of Lykurgos, and the theatre, therefore, was only used by the austere Spartans for gymnastic exercises, musical concerts, and public assemblies. It was here that the Spartans gave that astonishing proof of the strength of their character and discipline. The whole people was assembled at the festival of the *gymnopaidia*, which were celebrated by the youths singing hymns to the honor of Apollo, Artemis, and Dionysos, and performing the war-dance, in full armor, in the theatre, when the news arrived of the defeat of the Spartan army at Leuktra, the death of King Kleombrotas and of the most distinguished citizens. Yet the Ephors, keeping the secret, let the rejoicings continue, and when each family learned its loss, those Spartans only whose sons and relatives had perished showed themselves abroad, congratulating one another, while the widows and the mothers of the fallen warriors hurried with smiling faces to the temples to thank the gods for the glory they had bestowed on them—thus suppressing the internal sorrow and despair. All Hellas looked with wonder on Sparta. But when they shortly afterward gained the Tearless Victory, and returned triumphantly to the city, then their bosoms became unlocked, the tears flowed freely, and the women showed the full sensibility of their hearts.

On the same hill, at a short distance east of the theatre, we found, in 1838, some curious door-ways, or gates, of huge blocks of white marble, nearly buried in the rubbish up to their soffit. Others similar to these were at that time

seen on the southern hills, with an appearance of seats on the one side, as if the building had been a place of public assembly, opposite the market-place, and somewhat resembling the Pnyx at Athens. They hardly arose above the shrubbery, a proof that the soil had accumulated around them, and that interesting structures, and perhaps inscriptions, statues, vases, and other antiquities, may still lie hid beneath the soil.

In front of the theatre stands, or stood, among the olive trees, a large sepulchral chamber, built of white marble blocks. It is of an oblong form, twenty-two feet in breadth, and double the length; the blocks measure fifteen feet, and three layers were then in preservation. The inhabitants call it the Sepulchre of Leonidas, and this coincides with the account of Pausanias, who mentions the cenotaphion of the heroic king of Sparta in this direction. This, then, is a most precious monument, which ought to have been restored and revered by the modern Spartans; but alas! we are almost ashamed to confess, that on our second visit to Sparta, in August, 1843, not only the Doric doorways or porticoes just mentioned, but even this venerable sepulchre chamber, had been destroyed, in order to use the materials for the construction of the city of New-Sparta, rapidly arising on the southern hills, at half a mile's distance from the theatre. Great was the disgust of the architect, Mr. Schaubert, and myself, when, on our walk to the theatre, we found some New-Spartan citizens engaged in removing and cutting to pieces these beautiful marble blocks. We hurried back to the governor, at that time the learned and active Mr. Latris, who gave the necessary orders to the ignorant *bakalides* (shop-keepers) to replace the few blocks which had been left uninjured.

We had formerly seen several marble altars ornamented with sculptured bulls' heads and garlands of flowers, having the usual Doric inscription "The Senate and the People"—*ABOYAAKAIΘANOMOS*—lying scattered about among fragments of columns, Doric capitals, and heaps of free-stones. Some years afterward they had all disappeared, in

spite of the royal ordinance protecting the ancient monuments, and of the exertions and vigilance of the governor and several learned and intelligent members of the newly-established community.

Another highly interesting ruin from the Dorian times is a bridge over the Eurotas, to the north-east of the Castle-hill, where the road from Arkadia crosses the river and enters the city between the northern hill of Aphrodision and the central Akropolis. The river forms there an island, and is fordable at low water; banks, bridge, and island are overgrown with a rich vegetation of willows, myrtle, and oleander. This bridge is supposed to be the Babyka, or Babyx, to which reference is made in the oldest topographical notice of Sparta. It goes so far back as the Lykurgian Legislation, and is contained in the first *rhetra*, or compact, of his laws, wherein the oracle of Delphi is said to have directed Lykurgos to erect temples to Jupiter and Minerva, and to fix the seat of the Senate and the kings between the Babyka and the *Knakion*. The former, according to Aristotle, was a bridge; the latter, a river, which Plutarch explains as the obsolete name for the Oinus, discharging into the Eurotas, ten stadia above the bridge. Here, then, somewhere on the banks of the river, and outside the city, the *Ekklesia*, or national assembly of the Spartans, was held in the open air; for Plutarch adds that there were neither porticoes nor any other accommodation.* Some piers of the ancient bridge and its foundations can be pursued for a length of two hundred and forty-two feet on the side toward the city; yet it is evident that it has been repaired at different periods of time.

These are nearly all the remains of Dorian Sparta which we saw in 1838 and 1843, and no discoveries have since been made, as far as we have been able to learn.

* The reason why the Lawgiver left the place of assembly undetermined between the river Knakion and the Eurota-bridge, for a distance of ten stadia, or more than a mile, is supposed to be found in the general principle of the Lykurgian laws to hinder every concentration, to encourage widely-scattered settlements, and to remove the place of assembly far away from the market-place and its distractions.

The Roman ruins consist in the great aqueduct running north through the hills for several miles, many large brick ruins, and an amphitheatre—the only one in Greece—near the Eurotas. It is certainly the smallest in existence, being only one hundred and twenty-three yards in diameter, within the circus. It has exactly the form and construction, though in miniature, of the Roman amphitheatres in Italy and southern France. The outer buttresses and vaulted galleries supporting the ranges of seats are still seen, though the seats themselves have disappeared. The narrow space of the arena would hardly have permitted those terrible exhibitions of gladiatorial combats, or the chase of wild beasts, which formed the delight of the Roman public; and it would rather seem that this diminutive amphitheatre, or odeum, may have been employed for musical concerts, or some other such peaceful exhibitions.

Such is the present site of Sparta. Its few scattered relics have nearly vanished, with the exception of the Doric theatre; and the confused masses of Roman and Byzantine brick buildings still covering the hills will no doubt sooner or later suffer the same fate. How truly, therefore, has the ominous prophecy of the great Athenian historian, Thukydides, been fulfilled when he says that, if Lakedaimon were demolished, and nothing remained but its sacred buildings and foundations, men of a distant age would find a difficulty in believing the existence of its former power—that it had held beneath its sceptre two of the five divisions of Peloponnesos—that it had commanded the whole of Hellas, with its numerous allies and colonies—so inferior was the appearance of the city to its fame, being neither adorned with temples and splendid edifices, nor built in contiguity, but in separate quarters, in the rude style of remote ages: whereas if Athens, adds the historian, were reduced to a similar fate, it would be supposed from her magnificent ruins, that her power had been twice as great as the reality.* And indeed, when we stand on the Athe-

* Thukydides, i. 10.

nian Akropolis, among the indestructible monuments of the genius and power of that noble republic, its whole history, with all the vicissitudes of victory and defeat, starts forcibly on our mind, while the low and desolate hills of Sparta, sinking into insignificance beside the snow-decked peaks of the mighty Taygetos, the luxuriant vegetation of forest and field, and the rural solitude on the banks of the Eurotas, bring no remembrances to our mind that here stood the capital of the victors of Athens and the rulers of all Hellas. And yet do we herein find the true historical character of Lakedaimon typified in a highly remarkable manner. Untouched by the fear which caused the other Greeks to retire from their fields, and shut themselves up within their narrowly-built cities, behind walls and towers, the Spartans, continued to cherish the ancient Doric habits of life in the midst of their extensive rural establishments. Every Spartan citizen sojourned on his estate, in the valley of the Eurotas, with his family, and surrounded by his numerous Helots who tilled his fields. He trusted to the impregnable ramparts which Nature herself had piled up around his secluded and happy Lakonia; and when he carried his arms abroad, the nations sank before him—at home he roamed secure over mount and dale. His capital was only the great centre of the most populous township. Canals and water-courses, which were carefully carried through the plain occupied by the scattered villages of Sparta, and whose direction can, as we said above, still be traced near Magula and between the southern hills, watered the copious gardens and plantations that separated the squares of the different quarters, the sanctuaries, public buildings, and extensive farm-houses of the Spartan citizens. This rural independence, this tranquility and wealth, constituted the charm of Sparta, and stood in such singular contrast to the mercantile and artistic activity of Athens, with its noisy and bustling ports; its narrow lanes, densely inhabited by mechanics and workmen; its crowded theatres, tribunals, and popular assemblies, confined within the circumference of mighty walls and towers, that protected

Athens like an island in the ocean. It was in this sense of victory abroad and civic tranquility at home, that King Demaratos called his native capital the queen of all Hellenic cities, and that the poet Therpandros sang in praise of the justice and blissful security which reigned on the broad and shady avenues of Lakedaimon ; a picture so well understood by us Americans, who, in our open and widely built cities, beneath the rich foliage of our avenues and gardens, enjoy at the same time all the advantages and comforts of city-life combined with the healthy air and the fragrance of the forest.

Yet, though Sparta was not, like Athens, the teacher of the Hellenes in science and art, we must not, on the other hand, suppose that the Dorian city was without its ornaments in the various branches of architecture and sculpture, and these, in their peculiar beauty, exhibiting the stern and sombre character of the Dorian race. Ancient Sparta presented no doubt a varied aspect during the fifteen centuries of her existence. After the victorious termination of the Messenian and Argolic wars, she occupied the foremost position in Hellas as to military power and political and moral consideration. Sparta became likewise the centre of an active and intellectual life among the Dorians, and the seat of their science and arts. The aversion against foreigners had abated, and the Lakonian capital became frequently the residence of poets, musicians, and philosophers. Chilon, one of the seven sages, was a Lakedaimonian. Gitiades, Syadras, and Chartas were celebrated artists, architects, and founders in brass.* Sparta excelled particularly in works of iron, brass and other metals, like the Etruscans of Italy. Thus many tasteful monuments, temples, statues, vases, tripods, and other votive offerings, grew out of the Persian spoils. This old simplicity of manners and severe Doric style in architecture long con-

* The Spartans sent, in the 58th Olympiad, (548 B. C.,) a magnificent brass bowl, capable of containing three hundred amphore, and being covered outside with figures in bas-relief, as a present to King Kroisos, in Lydia. It fell, however, into the hands of pirates, and was afterwards admired in the temple of Juno, at Samos. Herodotus, i. 70.

tinued, and she became the wealthiest city in Greece, until the battle of Leuktra broke her political power. Her external appearance suffered the first change when her scattered townships were fortified with walls. She had then a circumference of six miles, or forty-eight stadia, and remained the capital and most populous city in the peninsula under the Roman empire.

Most of the inscriptions collected in Sparta are from this period, and they prove that the Cæsars of the Julian family extended a generous hand to her. Her squares and avenues became adorned with temples, statuary, and baths; aqueducts on hundreds of arches carried the distant mountain torrents into the city, and the Roman amphitheatre, on the Eurotas, was the only one to be found in Greece. A detailed account of the Roman city has been preserved to us by Pausanias, which, though confused and without great utility for topographical purposes, still astonishes us by the vast number of monuments he records, and the occasional historical remarks with which he accompanies his description. It fills no less than eight chapters of his work.

Sparta was still in good preservation, like Athens, Thebes, and other cities of Greece, toward the close of the fourth Christian century; but at the irruption of the Visigothic King Alaric into the Peloponnesos 396, Sparta was destroyed, and the whole of Lakonia devastated with fire and sword. Afterward a mediæval Byzantine and Christian Lakedaimonia rose on the ruins of the old. This, too, was conquered and occupied by the Frankish Crusaders in 1207, and became abandoned when Prince William Villehardouin, the Prince of the Morea, built his new city Misthrá, at the base of Mount Taygetos. Then came, in 1725, the French madman, Abbé Fourmont, the modern Alaric, with crow-bar and pick-axe, to do what mischief he could. What wonder, then, that so few relics of antiquity remain, though the late discoveries from casual excavations seem to promise a fruitful field for future researches.

Sparta, like Rome, was founded on a site which, already long before, had been occupied by small Achaian settle-

ments. These were not destroyed by the invading Dorians, but became incorporated in the city of the conquerors, without entirely losing their anti-Dorian names and traditions. Thus we find Sparta divided into four very ancient districts or villages—*komai*. Limnai and Pitane, on the right bank of the Eurotas; Kynosura, (that is, Dog's Tail) north-west on the spur of Mount Taygetos; and Mesoa on the south-east, toward Amyklai—all unite a common worship by their sanctuaries, and principally by the horribly barbarous rites of the Orthian Artemis, (Diana.) Sparta had no streets, but broad thorough-fares ran between these separate military camps toward the hill of the Akropolis and the market-place beneath it, as the common centre of the metropolis.*

When, therefore, a traveler in antiquity arrived in the valley of Lakonia, he would cross the Eurotas on the bridge Balyka, and through the suburb of Limnai enter the great market-place on the south of the Akropolis. We, however, shall first ascend to the Castle-hill, which, like that of Athens, remained for centuries the sanctuary of the tutelary divinities of the empire. Nor did it become a fortress until after the extinction of the Herakleidian dynasties, when the tyrants who usurped the power made it their stronghold, in which they placed their treasures and their body-guard of lawless mercenaries.

The principal site was occupied by the great temple of Athene *Poliouchos*, or protectress of the city. It was called the Brazen House, (*Chalkioikos*), and is described as having

* Herodotos mentions (iv., 149) another "principal tribe in Sparta," the *Aegida*, originally a band of Theban warriors, who had joined the Dorians at the time of their invasion of the Peloponnesos. Such is the account given by Pindar and his scholiast. Colonel Leake and others accept this *fifth tribe*, and place their village west of the Akropolis, in the plain of Magula. The Doric cities had everywhere the appearance of large villages. Only at a later period the Arkadian townships began to unite for the common protection, and to build fortified cities, such as Mantinea and Megalopolis. The first Greek cities, built in regular angles, with due regard to beauty and comfort, were those of Asia Minor. The celebrated architect Hippodamos, from Miletos, in Ionia, built the Peiræus, the well-known port and naval station of Athens, and the Dorian city of Rhodes, on the island of that name, with such a symmetry and beauty that the ancients, while expressing their admiration, exclaimed "that all Rhodes appeared like one palace!"

been built by the ancient Tyndarid princes. Long afterward, during the brilliant period of the *Æginetic* artists, in the sixth century B. C., the Lakedaimonians caused both the temple and the statue of the goddess to be covered with *brass* by the celebrated Spartan artist Gitiades, who, like Michael Angelo Buonarrotti of modern times, united in one person the architect, the sculptor, and the poet. Gitiades composed Doric poems and a hymn to the goddess, which was sung at her festival. His poetry was considered to be as beautiful as were his statues; and this Spartan master-mind seems thus to have developed the worship of Athena to its full extent.

The temple of Athena is supposed to have had its roof and colonnades made of brass. The walls, too, were covered with brazen reliefs, representing the actions of Herkules, the birth of Athena, the wars of Kastor and Pollux, and other scenes of Spartan mythology. All around the temple were vast colonnades, sanctuaries, and statues: and there, too, was the small house in which King Pausanias, the victor of the Persians and the traitor of Hellas, sought refuge after his condemnation. It is well known that his aged mother, with Spartan austerity, carried the first stone to the Akropolis, in order to wall up her ambitious and deluded son! All Sparta followed her example. The doors of the building were walled up, and Pausanias perished by hunger; yet the Delphian oracle afterward ordered the Spartans to place two statues of their king before the altar of the brazen temple.

Nearest to it stood that of Athena Ergane, as protectress of the artists; before the southern portico, the temple of Zeus Kosmetas, with the sepulchre of the first builder of the brass house, Tyndareos. The western portico was adorned with Eagles and Victories, as a monument of the naval triumphs of Lysander over the Athenians. The Chapel of the Muses, who, with their flutes and lyres led the Spartan armies to battle, faced the northern front of the brazen temple. Numerous ancient and highly-revered brazen statues, fastened together with nails, stood all around

the building, such as that of Venus Ambelogera, or life-prolonging, those of Sleep and Death, with many old wooden statues of great sanctity. These and other monuments are mentioned by Pausanias as still seen by him during his visit to Sparta, about the year 175 of our era ; but they seem to have been mostly of a comparatively late date, and of an inferior workmanship and material. They elicited no praise from the traveler, who, in his customary dry style, only says, that the great theatre was worthy to be seen.

The Spartan Akropolis, though less celebrated in history than those of other cities in Greece, was nevertheless the seat of ancient and memorable institutions, and the sacred asylum of Lakonia.

From the Castle-hill there were several descents to the great *Agora*, or *forum*, an extensive square on the south-east and south, which in the times of the Roman Empire had still preserved the form and arrangement of a Grecian market-place. It was surrounded by halls, bazaars, and public buildings, leaving intermediate spaces, through which the roads or avenues passed to the different quarters of the city. The *Agora* was the common centre for the traffic and commerce of Lakonia, and the emporium for cereals and fruits under the supervision of the five *empeloroï*—*agoranomoi*—or market-inspectors. Here were the fairs and exhibitions of Lakonian manufactures, and principally of the various iron utensils for which that country was celebrated. The *gerousia*, or senate, met there in the city-hall. The *Ephoroi*, or executive committee, and the *Bidiaioi*, or trustees of public instruction, had there likewise their offices and archives ; and in the numerous *phiditia* or *syssitia*, or public eating-houses, ranged around the square, the Spartan citizens, as table-companions, daily enjoyed their black-pork soup with dried figs, goat's cheese, garlic, and a measure of wine, constituting their frugal repasts. Forty officers of government and four thousand citizens, were frequently seen engaged in the *Agora*.

Yet the most interesting object there was the splendid

Persian portico, erected from the spoils of the Persians vanquished at Platea in 479. The architrave of the entablature was supported by colossal statues and Persian warriors (*Atlantes*) instead of columns, in the manner of the Caryatid Virgins at the Erechtheion on the Akropolis of Athens. Several of the figures were portraits, such as the Persian Commander-in-chief Mardonios, who fell in the battle, and Artemisia, the Queen of Halikarnassos, who distinguished herself in the naval combat of Salamis. Julius Caesar and Augustus loved Sparta, and adorned its square with magnificent buildings. In return the humble and grateful Spartans raised temples and altars on the eastern side of the Agora to their Roman masters. A particular space called the *Choros*, was fenced in and smoothly levelled as a dancing ground for the young Spartans at their religious dances, the *gymnopaidia*, in honor of Apollo. The statues of the Delphian gods adorned this circus all around. There, too, were placed the sepulchres of the unhappy Orestes and of Epimenides the Cretan philosopher, together with the statues of Zeus Xenios and Athena Xenia, both as protectors of the foreign guests in Sparta; and last of all, an immense colossus, which, towering high above the other buildings, represented the Spartan republic herself.

Though the Spartan Agora must have been inferior to that of Athens, and other Hellenic cities, yet, when considered without reference to the comparative perfection of art, simply from the general impression it would produce on the spectator, it no doubt presented a grand and imposing picture, being placed in relief against the admirable background of wood-clad hills and snow-capped mountains, in an atmosphere which colors and beautifies even the bleak and barren crags and crumbling ruins.

From the market-place several broad avenues or thoroughfares diverged like radii, in an eastern, southern, and south-western direction. They separated in part the townships of Pitane, Messoa, *Ægidæ*, and Kynosura. The most eastern avenue, called *Skias*, from a large rotunda in the

form of a tent, built by the Samian architect Theodoros, in which citizens of Sparta assembled in later times, skirted the hill Kolona, and after crossing the brook of Tiasa on a bridge, led on to the neighboring town of Therapne, situated on the slope of the Menelaion range beyond the Eurotas.

The second, the largest, and most frequented road, the *Aphetais*—the Corso or Broadway of Sparta—went south likewise, crossing the river Tiasa on a stone bridge, parts of the causeway and piers of which are still visible on the banks. It traversed the fertile plain, and reached the sacred temple of Apollo, the great Dorian sanctuary at Amyklai.

Among a great number of monuments mentioned by Pausanias as situated on and between these large thoroughfares, some few remains of the foundations of the Temple of Hera and Apollo were met with, on isolated mounds, some few years ago; but they have vanished, and their site is at present occupied by the cathedral church and city-hall of New-Sparta. While digging the foundations of these modern buildings, the workmen found a number of inscriptions, fragments of statues, such as a beautiful Hermes, two small statues of Æsculapius, the torso of a Satyr, bas-reliefs of Cybele, and a fine bearded head, by modern Spartans supposed to have belonged to a statue of old Lykurgos himself.

All these precious remains were deposited in the new town-hall, as a beginning of a Doric museum. There we saw them in 1838; but a year later a fire broke out in the *eparcheion*, or government-house; and as every body was employed in saving the public money and the archives, and none cared for the antiquities, the entire collection was consumed. Happily the inscriptions, some of which, though unimportant with regard to Spartan history, are curious, as characterizing the times of flattery and degradation, under Augustus and Tiberias, had been copied and published at Athens.

A third road ran westward toward Mount Taygetos. It

passed by the theatre; and opposite to it Pausanias describes the cenotaphion of the heroic King Leonidas, who fell so bravely fighting with his three hundred Spartans, at Thermopylæ in 480. Hence there appears to be some reason for believing that the white marble monument seen among the olive trees in that direction, is the sepulchre alluded to. It was a pleasant custom that speeches on the distinguished men of Sparta were publicly made before the assembled people, near the monument of Leonidas. Other marble pillars around recorded the names of the companions of the hero who fell with him obedient to the laws of their country.

We now turn toward the Eurotas, where, beneath the precipitous bank, we find a beautiful thicket of lofty poplars and plane-trees, at the junction of the rivulet Tiasa with that river. This was the fighting-ground of the young Spartans, called *Platanistas*, from the plane-trees with which the ground was bordered. It was then an island, surrounded by water from the two rivers; two bridges led into it, on each of which was a statue—of Herakles at one end, and of Lykurgos at the other. The young Spartans having finished their sacrifices in the *Phoibaion*, or sanctuary of Apollo, near Therapne, crossed the bridges and rushed against one another, each endeavoring to drive the opposing party into the water. These warlike exercises of the Lakedaimonian youths continued for centuries after the subjection of Sparta to all-conquering Rome, and both Cicero and Plutarch describe the furious struggle of the young combatants here in the island of the Plantains, as they themselves witnessed it in their days.

Not far off is another interesting spot, which we can identify with the ancient locality. I mean the beautiful fountain gushing forth beneath the high bank on which the modern town is situated. It is the ancient spring Dorkeia, near which stood the monument of the Princess Kyniska, the first victress in the Olympian chariot-race, with several heroes of Dorkeus, Sebrion, the sanctuary of Helena, the sepulchre of the Spartan poet Alkman, and those of the Hippokoontidai.

Continuing our route north through the meadows along the Eurotas, now thickly planted with Indian corn—*kalam-vokki*—we arrive at the place called *Dromos*, where the young Spartans had their gymnasium and race-ground. Here stood a palace of the Pelopid kings, and among the many temples were those of Kastor and Pollux, of Lucina and the Graces.

We turn the sharp corner of the Issorion, one of the strongest and most important positions for the defense of Sparta, and therefore occupied by Agasilaos and his bravest warriors, during the invasion of Epaminondas and the Thebans. At the base of the hill was discovered, in 1840, a tomb excavated in the rock. On the cover is seen a figure in bold relief, larger than nature, enveloped in the Spartan mantle. The Greeks call it King Agis, and they have some reason for doing so, as the family sepulchres of the royal dynasty of the Agidæ were situated on the east of the Akropolis, near the Eurotas.

We continue our walk northward, leaving the Balyka bridge on our right, and the principal entry to the market-place on the left, and traverse a low, swampy ground, in antiquity the suburb or village called *Limnai*, where, in the temple of Artemis (Diana) Orthia, the young Spartans underwent the cruel discipline of flagellation, before the blood-stained altar of the goddess. This barbarous custom was not originally Greek, but introduced into Sparta from Tauris on the Pontus Euxinus, where human sacrifices continued to a late period.

The wooden statue of this goddess, which from remote antiquity was here worshipped with these horrible foreign rites, was lost during the storms of the Doric invasion, when the aboriginal inhabitants were expelled from Lakonia. But having been found again among the shrubbery in the bottom-lands of the Eurotas by Astrabakos and Alopekos, the barbarous worship of Diana was restored, and her altars were again stained with human blood. Yet, instead of slaughtering the victims, Lykurgos introduced the flagellation of the youths. The priestess of Diana at-

tended the disgusting scene with the small wooden image of the goddess on her arm. What an insight does such a picture give us into the dark superstition and cold-hearted arrogance of the Spartans! No wonder that they were as much hated by the other Greeks, as the Athenians were loved. In gratitude for his humanity, Lykurgos had his temple near that of the goddess and of the Heroon of As-trabakos, the finder of the statue.

In the temple of Aphrodite, the *Aphrodision*, standing beyond on the northernmost hill, the statue of the smiling goddess of love and joy was seen with shield and lance in full armor, according to the ideas of the warlike Spartans. On the west of the Akropolis was the splendid temple of *Æsculapius*, another of Lykurgos' many monuments of great Spartan warriors, and a large portico, richly adorned with paintings, which served as a place of assembly and conversation to the citizens. Here another cruel act of the severe Spartan discipline took place. The new-born children were carried by their fathers to the painted portico, before the grave old men of their own tribe, who permitted them to live, if robust and healthy, but ordered those who seemed weakly and delicate to be cast into a deep chasm of Mount Taygetos. This den of death, no doubt one of the dreadful chasms behind the castle hill of Misthrá, relieved the Spartans from the necessity of erecting working-houses or enacting poor-laws. The surplus population went into the pit! Of these buildings several foundations are still seen near the village of Magoula, and in the surrounding mulberry-grove.

The high and precipitous line of hills forming a strong defensive position toward the Eurotas, and the steady bravery of the Spartan battalions or *moras* of heavy-armed hoplitæ, were able for centuries to repel the enemy. Even a surprise by Epaminondas, a few days previous to the great battle at Mantinea in Arkadia, where he fell, was beaten off by a handful of resolute Spartans.

Epáminondas, advancing secretly during the night, had quickly passed the defiles of Sellasia, and suddenly appear-

ing on the bridge Balyka, the Theban army entered the Limnaion suburb, and pressed on to the market-place. But in the narrow defile, between the steep Issorion and the still higher hill of the Akropolis, where every temple and sanctuary served as a barrier, the Thebans found themselves furiously encountered by the few Spartans left in the city and their armed retainers; and although Epaminondas succeeded for a moment in forcing his way to the entrance of the Agora, he was nevertheless soon obliged to retreat beyond the river, with a heavy loss of his most daring warriors.

Sparta was built of less durable materials than Athens. Her fame has outlived her monuments. Yet the disappearance of the Dorian monuments is in part owing, incredible as it seems, to the madness and vanity of a French clergyman, the Abbé de Fourmont. This learned, but vain and arrogant French savant was sent by Louis XV., in 1728, to Greece, where he partly found and partly forged numerous inscriptions which puzzle the sagacity and criticism of the learned philologists even to the present day.

Abbé Fourmont sought immortality by copying inscriptions and describing monuments, and then wilfully destroying every trace of the originals. In the absurd letters which he at that time wrote home to the minister of state, and other distinguished literary men of France, he says, for instance:

"Oh! with what inexpressible delight have I for months been occupied in levelling and destroying old Sparta! I have not left one stone on another. Sixty Lakonian workmen, with crow-bars and pick-axes, are, from morning till night, breaking down the temples, annihilating every trace of that devoted city, while I, with an exulting feeling of victory and glory, proclaim to the world: *Carthago fuit*—Sparta was, and is no more!"*

* In another letter to the French Prime Minister, M. de Mauzépas, the crazy Abbé continues running on in this blundering style:

"Je l'ai fait non pas, abattre mais raser de fond en comble; il n'y a plus de cette grande ville une pierre sur une autre. Depuis plus de trente jours, trente, et quelque fois soixante ouvriers, abattant, détruisent, exterminent la ville de Sparte! . . . Si, en renversant ses murs et ses temples; si,

In reading such fiendish malice, such monstrous absurdity, we certainly would suppose, not only that the French clergyman was more fit for a lunatic asylum than for visiting Greece; but even that his vain boastings bore untruth on their face. This was the opinion of Chandler, Colonel Leake and other eminent travelers of a more modern date. Nevertheless, we must confess that at different places in Arkadia and Lakonia, both at Tegea, Belmina, and Sparta herself, we still find traces of this destructive fury of the fanatic Frenchman. We there see marble slabs, on which both ornaments and inscriptions have carefully been destroyed by the chisel, while in other places fragments of inscriptions, already published by the Abbé, are still existing, thus proving again, that some at least of his hundreds of inscriptions are genuine, though the greater number, no doubt, may have been his own compilations, invented only with the malicious intention of leading his learned brother pedants astray.

The present capital of Lakedaimon owes its origin to a royal decree, by virtue of which it is considered not only the chief place in the province, but the second city in the kingdom of Greece. Among many other brilliant promises of royal munificence, was that of a high-road across the Bardounian ridge to the sea-port of Sparta at Gytheion, (Marathonisi,) and another carriage-road through the mountain-passes north to Tripolis in Arkadia. Such a combination of roads would give the modern Lakedaimonians an easy communication with the sea and the interior of Peloponnesos, and be of incalculable advantage to their industry and the export of their valuable products. But alas! roads are more easily laid out on paper than carried over rugged mountains; the native inhabitants are too ignorant and indolent to support government in its benevolent exertions for the welfare of the country, and though twelve years have passed since our visit, we fear that those brilliant

— en ne laissant pas une pierre sur une autre au plus petit de ses *sacellum* son lieu sera dans la suite ignoré, j'ai au moins de quoi la faire reconnaître, et c'est quelque chose. Je n'avais que ce moyen de rendre mon voyage illustre!"

plans have not yet been realized, and that New-Sparta is still lingering in her state of infancy. The prospect at that time, however, was cheering, and Amaliapolis, being the residence of the bishop, the civil and military officers of the administration, grew up with some rapidity. The Government House, the Archiepiscopacy, the royal silk-factory, and Greek church were fine-looking and solid buildings. The principal street was lined with a hundred edifices, consisting of stores, coffee-houses, and barracks for the gendarmerie and the light companies which were stationed there, to have a look-out on the roving mountaineers of the Taygetos.

The *Nomarchos*, or Governor, Mr. Levendis, received us with truly oriental hospitality, and we were thus enabled to spend some delightful days in one of the most beautiful and interesting regions of the world.

The valley of Lakonia being extensively planted with mulberry trees, silk makes an important export article. The establishment for spinning silk, conducted by Italian artists, therefore excited our curiosity, and we visited the factory in the afternoon.

The Norman king, Roger of Naples and Sicily, transported the Greek silk-worms and silk-weavers to Italy during the Crusades. Naples now sends back her workmen for the instruction of the Greeks. A number of young Greeks, men and women, were attending the operation of spinning of the silk from the cocoons as apprentices, and we were amused at beholding their astonishment at the liveliness of the Italian women, who, while working, were singing Italian opera songs in full chorus. The production of silk in Lakonia has made a great progress within the last twenty years, and the price of the Lakonian silk has doubled at the market of Lyons.

The environs of Sparta were described by ancient writers as delightfully situated, and in high cultivation. Sanctuaries, villas, and hamlets were scattered through the beautiful groves and gardens—a peaceful region, in which the women of Lakedaimon for five centuries, from Lykur-

gos to Epaminondas, did not behold the fires of a hostile camp. Two flourishing towns, Amyklai, south in the plain, and Therapne, beyond the Eurotas, on the slope of the Menelaion range, were both situated at a short distance from the capital. The left bank of the river did not belong to Sparta. Its habitations, however, formed a suburb, which stood in communication with the city by means of the Balyka bridge. When Epaminondas with the Theban army, in 370, burning and destroying, descended the river, he attempted in vain to storm the bridge, being repelled by the young Spartan warriors, who occupied the Temple of Athena Alea and the other sanctuaries on the opposite bank. The prudent Theban, therefore, drew back his troops, and continued his march down the stream toward Therapne. We followed his example, and ascended the steep Menelaion hill, on which one of the most ancient and important monuments was discovered in 1834. It consists of an obtuse pyramid, one hundred and eight feet square at the base, and rising in three terraces to a height of sixteen feet; the middle offset, or terrace, is eighty-four feet square, and the upper sixty-eight. It crowns the summit of the mountain, being seven hundred and sixty feet precipitous above the river bed of the Eurotas. It is solidly constructed of immense blocks of a darkened, conglomerate lime-stone. Its terminating cone is wanting, together with its glittering covering of Parian marble; but enough of the pile is standing to identify it with the ancient so highly revered temple of Menelaos and Helena, which, by its commanding position, must have presented the grandest and most prominent object in the valley of Lakonia. To this sanctuary rode the virgins and matrons of Sparta in their long processions of adorned chariots, and implored Helena to grant beauty to themselves and their children; while the men invoked the hero Menelaos for valor and victory. All around the terraced steps were found numerous small leaden images, in the shape of diminutive crowns or diadems, and others in the rigid, antiquated form, representing small figures of veiled statues of women and armed

warriors in full panoply—no doubt votive offerings of the pious Spartans. The excavations at that time were left unfinished on account of the heat of summer and an epidemic fever which forced the antiquarian, Dr. Lewis Ross, and the architects to leave Sparta; yet, by a future renewal of the works, we may with confidence expect the discovery of the subterraneous sepulchres of the Pelopid kings.*

Therapne, the residence of the Achaian kings, lay on the slope of the mountain, on a spot, sacred by its ancient rites and from the traditions of the native heroes, long before the Dorian conquest of Peloponnesos: there the twin-brothers, the *Dioskouri*, ruled in their high-turreted castle, and lay buried in the depths of Therapne; there Menelaos, in his glittering palace, received Telemachos at his festal board. The whole region around presented sacred recollections to the Spartans; for on the road to the bridge lay the Sanctuary of Æsculapius, that of Ares, built by the Dioskuri, and that of Pollux himself. Their own temple stood on the right bank of the Eurotas, in the Phoibaion, where the young Spartan warriors sacrificed to their handsome and youthful heroes, and marched boldly to war under their sure guardianship.†

From Therapne we rode in an hour to Sklavochori, or the town of the Slavonians, situated among the ruins of

* Womanly beauty was then as highly appreciated in Sparta as it is now in America. A Lakonian nurse, perceiving that the child intrusted to her care was mis-shapen, and that the parents felt this to be a great misfortune, went every day to the Temple of Helen at Therapne, and, presenting the child to the image, entreated the goddess to change her ugliness to beauty. One day, while leaving the sanctuary, a woman appeared before her, and asking to see the ugly child, she stroked its head with her hands, and said that she would surpass all the women of Sparta in beauty; and from that day the baby's appearance began to change, and she became the most charming bride in Sparta. See Herodot. Erato, 61.

† Kastor and Polydeukes, the Tyndarids, were the great patrons of Sparta, and held in the highest veneration. During the second Messenian war, two handsome Messenian youths, Panormos and Gonippos, imitating the white dress and gilt armor of the Dioskuri, and mounted on milk-white steeds, galloped suddenly into the midst of the hostile camp while the Spartans were sacrificing and feasting. These superstitious warriors, believing their gods to appear before them, fell down on their faces adoring, while the youths, riding about, slaughtered a great number with their lances before the stratagem was discovered, and returned unhurt to Andania. See Pausanias, iv. 27.

Amyklai, at the base of Mount Taygetos. The scenery is the most delightful in the world; the road runs between orange and lemon groves, interspersed with sombre cypresses, while numerous rills from the clefts of the overhanging mountains clothe the soil with a rich carpet of shrubbery and flowers, and refresh the sultry heat of the day. Amyklai lies about four miles from Sparta along the great avenue of the Hyakinthean procession. Here the Spartans celebrated, with great pomp of music and sacrifices, their national festivals—the *Hyakinthia* in midsummer, and *Karneia* in September. The latter was an imitation of Sparta camp-life, on the plain before the temple of the Amyklaian Apollo, the tutelar deity of the Dorians. On the banks of a copious rivulet from the Taygetos, in a sacred grove, stood the old sanctuary, which must have been preserved through the fearful wars that, during the era of the decline of Sparta, swept over her beautiful plain—since it was still admired, with all its artistic treasures, by Pausanias, in the second century after Christ. The temple-buildings themselves did not attract his attention; but he describes with admiration the statuary, alike important on account of its antiquity or of its masterly execution.

The colossal statue of the Sun-god, fifty feet high, was a work of the rudest and most ancient kind, and resembled a column of brass, with the exception of the face, hands, and feet. It wore a helmet, and held in the hands a spear and bow. It stood on a pedestal formed like an altar, which was supposed to be the tomb of Hyakinthos, and richly adorned with statues and bas-reliefs in bronze. This colossal throne was supported by statues of the Charites and Flora; on the right were Echidna and Typhos, on the left Tritons, and the base contained, in forty-two compartments, subjects from the mythology of Dorian gods and heroes. The enchanter, or sculptor, of this magnificent thoreutic work was Bathykles, from Magnesia, on the Maiandros in Asia-Minor, who, about the 29th Olympiad, 664 B. C., with a number of his pupils, found a kind reception

and plenty of work at Sparta. A century later, in a period of victory and glory, the Spartans obtained a quantity of gold from Kroisos, the king of Lydia, with which they gilded the statue of their revered god.

Greek antiquaries found in Amyklai many important monuments of the early history of their country; among these was the celebrated group of five bronze tripods, of which the three most ancient were said to have been dedicated from the tenth of the spoils of Ithome, in the first Messenian war, 722 B. C.; the others, which were of a larger size, from the Athenian booty at the naval victory of Aigospotamoi, in 404. The feet of the tripods were adorned with beautiful sculptures in bas-relief. Two of the most ancient, with the statues of Aphrodite and Artemis, were the work of the above-mentioned Lakedaimonian artist, Gitiades; the third, with the statue of the Kore, (Proserpina,) was by Kallon, the head of the Æginetic school, in the 59th Olympiad, or 544 B. C. Sparta, with a lyre in her hand, was represented on the fourth tripod, the work of Aristandros; and on the fifth was Aphrodite, by Polykleitos. Yet the ruthless sword of Alaric and his Goths, who invaded Lakonia in 396, no doubt destroyed these precious relics of former grandeur and glory, and Apollo at Amyklai shared then the same fate as the goddess Demeter (Ceres) in her temple at Eleusi in Attika.

During the seventh and eighth centuries, the greater part of Peloponnesos was occupied by different Slavonic tribes, who settled down in the rich valley of Lakedaimon, where they have left their memorial in a number of villages on the mountains all around Sparta, such as Sklavochori, here on the ruins of Amyklai, and *Varsava*, (Warsaw,) *Bilova*, *Sitzova*, *Arákhova*, *Vrístena*, *Tzintzina*, *Polovitza*, *Levétzova*, on the east and south. Sklavochori was burnt by the Turks during the Russian invasion of 1772, and only eight or nine churches and chapels, in ruins, look out from the forest trees that now cover the ground. Yet some foundations of huge square blocks, fragments of Dorian marble capitals, and inscriptions with the letters

A M Y K, still identify the site of the ancient Amyklaion. At a short distance, a Hellenic castle, towering high on a projecting spur of the Taygetos, looks down on the plain below. It can not, however, be the ancient Achaian *fortress of Amyklai*, which, at the time of the Dorian conquest of Lakonia, was given as a feudal tenure to the native chief Philonomos, for betraying his king and siding with the invaders. Some ruins on a hill, near the village of Kyriakós, eastward a thousand paces from the Eurotas, and in a position commanding the plain, seem to indicate the site of that fortress. Excavations there would, perhaps, throw more light on the subject.

Though the Amyklaians thus recognized the sovereignty of the Dorian kings of Sparta, they, nevertheless, for several centuries, defended their independence and territory, and it was not until they had weakened themselves by military expeditions to Æolis, Achaia, and Crete, that Teleklos, king of Sparta, at last succeeded in subduing and destroying the last remnant of the aboriginal inhabitants of Lakonia. The victors, however, preserved the sanctuaries of their vassals; adopted their religious rites; and thus Amyklai became the centre of the national festivals, processions, and popular rejoicing of all Lakedaimon.

Another discovery likewise tending to prove the high antiquity of the Menelaian monument of Therapne, was made by Mr. Gropius, the learned Consul-General of Austria and Denmark, in the year 1805, on a hill near the village Vaphiό—the ancient Pharis—a mile south of Amyklai, on the banks of the Eurotas.

The consul began to excavate a regular mound or tumulus, and there discovered a circular subterranean chamber, which, in the form of a dome, terminates at a point, or key-stone, similar to the celebrated Treasury of Atreus at Mykenai. Like that, it was entered by a door on one side, the access to which was pierced horizontally through the slope of the hill. Vaphiό, the village, is standing on a line of hills running south along the Eurotas, the highest point of which is formed by this tumulus. The doorway

is entire. It is six feet wide at the upper and narrower part. The lintel is one immense stone, fifteen feet in length. At Mykenai that of the Treasury is no less than twenty-seven feet in length.* The vault itself at Vaphiό is forty feet in diameter; at Mykenai it is forty-eight feet. They appear likewise to be both from the same remote period. Most unhappily the vault of the treasury in Lakonia has fallen in, and the greater part of its materials was carried away by order of Count Capo d'Istria; so at least the villagers say. Yet the lower part of the round cavity is still in perfect preservation, and might easily be restored. Amyklai and Therapne were populous cities before the Dorians. Menelaos, like the Tyndaridæ before him, resided in Therapne. There, too, we see his sepulchral monument. At Amyklai we find the great and sacred temple, the centre of the traditions, religious rites, and political union of the different races; and at Pharis, according to a lately-restored passage in Strabo, we behold the royal vault or treasury (*tamēion*) and armory of the Homeric hero. We may thus rejoice at having ascertained three of the oldest historical monuments in Europe, which throw so brilliant a light on the traditional ages of Hellas.

But our discoveries do not rest here; we have a fourth as interesting as the three last mentioned, and perhaps from the same early period; we mean the beautiful ancient Hellenic bridge at Xerokampi, in Southern Lakonia.

Continuing our route from Amyklai south, along the foot of the terrible precipices of Mount Taygetos, we pass the river Phellia, and enter a fine olive-grove, which extends six miles to the modern village Palaiá Panaghiá, lying in the interior angle of the Lakonian valley, between the Bardounian range on the south and the highest peak of the Taygetos on the west, in a region called by the moderna,

* Remarkable instances of still larger building-stones are those of the temple area at Mount Moriah, in Jerusalem, which are sixty feet in length; and those of the gigantic temple of the Sun-god at Heliopolis, (Baalbek,) in Syria, attain even a length of seventy-five feet. Some of those immense blocks have never been removed from the quarries in the neighborhood, where they are still lying.

Xerokampi, or desert plain. Here an ancient road crossed the Taygetos. The deep chasm or ravine through which it passes, forms one of the most picturesque prospects of the chain, because it permits a full view toward the interior valleys, to the high table-land with its villages, and to the crowning peak, Taleton, immediately overhanging the cleft. On our emerging from the wood, and turning up the ravine, the Cyklopean bridge presented itself full in front, spanning the chasm by a bold arch, which, seen from below, fills the mind with admiration and delight. No entire ancient bridge had hitherto been known to exist within the limits of Greece; nay, the architects had even questioned the ability of the ancient Greeks to throw an arch! They, therefore, pretended that all arches seen in aqueducts and other monuments, were of Roman construction. But this hypothesis, like so many others, has now fallen to the ground. The three vaulted chambers at Orchomenos in Boiotia, at Mykenai and Vaphi6, and the fine arched bridge at Xerokampi prove to the contrary.*

Here we stand again before a monument, which, on account of its colossal dimensions and finished workmanship, our traveling companion, the Architect Chevalier de Schaubert, considered as a relic from remote antiquity. The masonry of the arch, the piers, and the walls connected with each, are ancient and in excellent preservation, only the parapet of poor rubble work is modern; and where the outer of the Cyklopean blocks of the facing, on both sides of the flanks, have fallen away, we see traces of Turkish repairs. The stones of the arch are four or five feet long, three in breadth, and two in thickness. In size and proportion they are similar to those of the Akropolis of Mykenai, and, perhaps, of the same period. The span of the arch is twenty-seven feet, and the breadth of the causeway, between the modern parapets, is seven.

* Those readers who have visited Italy may, perhaps, here remember the beautiful Roman bridge, from the era of Augustus, thrown over the deep valley of the Nera, between Narni and Civita Castellana, on the road from Perugia to Rome. The Roman arch spans a wider distance, but the archaic, Cyklopean, masses give a greater interest to the Hellenic bridge in Lakonia.

Interesting as is the bridge, its beauty is still heightened by the magnificence of the scenery, and the vigorous growth of myrtle, oleander, agnus castus, and other fine shrubbery, from out of which the gold-tinged marble arch swings itself across the glen, high above the torrent, that foaming and chafing, dashes below. But how can we account for the singular fact of the ancients constructing this marble bridge in so remote and secluded a corner of the mountain, so far away from the main thoroughfares of Lakedaïmonia, in a region which was not visited by Pausanias, nor mentioned by any ancient author? We think to find an answer to this question in the discovery of an ancient carriage-road that here crossed Mount Taygetos. The defile of Xerokampi, lies in the gap beneath the highest peak of the mountain, whence not only the nearest descent is found to Armyros and Pherai (Kalamata) in Messenia, on the west side of the chain, but there likewise branch off the steep bridle-paths leading to the fertile table-lands on the slopes, and from thence along the forest-covered flanks, to the summit of Taleton, the highest peak of Taygetos. Here altars were consecrated to the sun-god Phoibos Apollon, to whom the Spartans sacrificed horses every year, when they, in procession and with great pomp, ascended to the mountain. The ceremony of slaughtering fine white steeds to the Sun was Persian. On the south of the pass lies *Euoras*, another of the high summits of Taygetos, and the region between both is by Pausanias called *Theras*, being the great hunting district of the Spartans. The forests on those heights furnished a plentiful chase of mountain-goats, bears, wild boars, and principally deer. Nor were these elevated regions without their sanctuaries. On the slope stood a temple of the Eleusinian Demeter, and the ancient Lakedaïmonians pointed out the place where the wounded Hercules was healed by Æsculapius.

Above the bridge on the left bank of the torrent, we see the ancient carriage-road cut in the living rock, and discover an inscription still legible on the precipitous wall : *ΟΡΟΣ* or *boundary*. Along the road runs an ancient aque-

duct, for more than six miles, following all the sinuosities of the descent. The channel for the water-course is beautifully cut out of the rock, here and there supported by low parapets, which is the only part of the conduit that has gone to ruin. In the upper region of Taygetos, several mills are still in use, near a large artificial tank or reservoir, and the inhabitants of Palaiá Panaghiá told us that with an expense of thirty thousand drachms, or five thousand American dollars, the entire aqueduct might be restored, to the great advantage of the inhabitants of the plain. Two years before the outbreak of the war of independence, the Turkish Agá of the village had offered the Spartan peasants to undertake this restoration at his own expense, on their promise of paying triple taxes for ten years. The villagers declared themselves willing to do so—so important did this undertaking appear to them. The work was begun in the upper part of the chasm, but soon the war broke out and resulted in the slaughter or exile of all the Turks and Albanians in Lakonia and the rest of the Morea.

The president, Count Capo d'Istrias, afterwards made a second attempt, but this project, like so many others of the Count's happy inspirations, remained only on paper. The dell itself is one of the most gloomy and romantic we ever entered. An immense rock, thrown down by an earthquake from the threatening peaks above, now forms a natural gate-way, not so lofty, however, as that more celebrated one in Virginia, but certainly as picturesque.

Within the gap, but unseen from the road, opens the narrow inlet to a deep grotto, where the women and children from the villages of Palaiá Panaghiá, Xerokampi, Komustá, and others in the neighborhood, fled for safety, during the invasion of Ibrahim Pashá in 1826.

With astonishment we distinguish the wheel-ruts of the ancient carriages along the artificial road, winding ziz-zag through the glens of Taygetos. Nay, it seems highly probable that these grooves or channels were scooped out at a distance to the ordinary span of a carriage on purpose, in

order to steady and direct the course of the wheels, and lighten the weight of the draught on the rocky, slanting ground; in the same manner as the sockets of our present railroads. Such regular wheel-ruts we observe in many places in Greece, in mountain-passages, principally those leading to the much-frequented temples or places consecrated to Panhellenic games, as for instance, Delphi on Mount Parnassos, at Nemea, Olympia, Eleusis, and others.

Old Homer seems to indicate this route across Taygetos, in his *Odyssey*, where he so beautifully describes the visit of young Telemachos to Menelaos, the king of Lakedaimon, in quest of his father Odysseus.

Telemachos lands on the shore of sandy Pylos—the present Navarino—where he is feasted by old Nestor. From thence he performs his journey to Sparta in two days on his chariot, reposing the first night at Pharai, now Kalamata, on the Messenian gulf. Next day he crosses the towering barrier of Mount Taygetos, no doubt on this less precipitous route, following the intricate valleys and the deep gap, south of Taleton, the highest point of the ridge, which, even to this day, forms the frontier of Lakedaimonia toward the Upper Máni, now called the Province of Lakonia. This is the only passage south of Sparta, while the nearest path, directly west of that city by the valley of Trypi, is the most dangerous track we ever passed, not excepting even those of Mount Lebanon in Syria, where not even a horse, much less a carriage can pass, without the greatest danger. Those formidable precipices, and the short turns on slippery rocks, overhanging the yawning abyss beneath, made our horses tremble for fear. Unloading their burdens a dozen times, and tying handkerchiefs over their eyes, we at last succeeded in leading them across the most dangerous passage at Kútzova-Ladá, on our descent to Kalamata.

If, therefore, we can attempt to transfer the poetry of Homer to actual localities in Greece, we would suppose that it was on this more southern route, so ingeniously cut through the rocks, that the bard carried his Telemachos and the prancing steeds of the Gerenian rider, Nestor.

We spoke of the ancient sacrifices to the Sun-god. A very steep bridle-path still conducts the wanderer through splendid pine forests to the chapel of St. Elias, the successor of Apollo, standing on the brow of the highest peak. Here the eye commands one of the most wonderful views in the world. Not only the entire range of Taygetos, with the Lakonian and Messenian gulfs at our feet, and the promontory of Tainaron and that of Malea, with the islands of Kythera, distant Candia, (Crete,) and the blue mirror of the African sea in front—oh no! the eye wanders with inexpressible delight over the violet and purple ridges of Arkadia and Argolis, and rests at last on the charming islands of Zante and Kephallonia, beautifully, in bold forms and in towering snow capped mountains, emerging from the deep-blue surface of the Ionian sea.

Such is the view from the Spartan altars on Mount Taygetos. The conquest of Messenia and the victories over Argos, raised Sparta about the fifteenth Olympiad, 550 B. C., to the supremacy in the Peninsula. Whoever holds the Taygetos, possesses the Akropolis of the Peloponnesos. The Lakedaimonians had now united both slopes of that ridge into a powerful state: they had thus secured their country by an impervious frontier, and, steeled, by their Lykurgæan constitution at home, they not only obtained the deciding vote in the general councils of the Dorian confederacy, but their word or sword settled henceforth all disputes among the allies, and their influence soon began to extend beyond the Peloponnesos. In Athens they drove the Peisistratid tyrants from the Akropolis, and restored the popular government. Their fame spread to Asia, and Kroisos, king of Lydia, sent them ambassadors with presents and offers of alliance, and afterward their assistance was implored in preference to Athens, by Aristagoras and the Ionians of Asia Minor, against the Persians.

Thus at the outbreak of the great Persian war, 500 B. C., Sparta took the command of the Hellenic forces. But after the fall of Leonidas at Thermopylæ, and the invasion of Attika by Xerxes, she demanded, true to her principles

of self-defence, that the Athenians and other Greeks beyond the Isthmus, should abandon their homes and withdraw within the barriers of the Peloponnesos, which, as the stronghold of all Hellas, was alone to be defended against the barbarians. Yet the brilliant genius of Themistokles, the activity and patriotism of the Athenians decided the question against Sparta, by the decisive naval battle of Salamis. Athens outflanked her ally, and spreading her sails on her own element, she built up the powerful Ionian confederacy which awarded to her great leaders that *hegemony* or general command, from which Sparta retired in sullen and offended pride.

Henceforth the friendship between Dorians and Ionians was at an end. Aristocracy and democracy were now to enter the lists in deadly feud. The Athenian alliance among the maritime cities and the islands was an artificial combination, offensive from its nature, and held together by the Athenian fleets; while Sparta, relying on the congeniality of feelings and common interests of her Dorian allies, in her defensive position behind the Isthmus, strengthened herself by concentration in the same manner as Athens became weakened, by too great extension.

The Spartans, despising all the pomp and glitter of their rivals, still preserved intact the austere institutions of Lykurgos at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war. It was the longest and most destructive the world had seen. Sparta, victorious on sea and land, humiliated her rival, and obtained a second time the supremacy in Hellas. Yet her political moderation and the austere simplicity of her manners now necessarily gave way to the ambitious aspirations of a Lysander and an Agasilaos. Her fleets swept the *Ægean*; her *harmosts*, with their Spartan garrisons, occupied the allied cities and distant colonies, where the governments were changed, and aristocracies sprung up at the wink of haughty and overbearing Lakedaimon. The armies of the Persian king were defeated; but his gold excited disturbances in Greece, and though Sparta yet sustained her dominion in Europe by giving up her conquests

in Asia Minor, she could not long maintain a supremacy which had now no other support than the terror of her arms. The battle of Leuktra decided the downfall of the Spartan rule. The allies fell off one by one, and soon Epaminondas and his Thebans appeared before Sparta herself. Her defence in the hour of danger was truly heroic; the enemy retired; but the Messenian Helots became freemen, and from their strongly-fortified Messene harassed Sparta in the flank; while the united Arkadians from Megalopolis stopped her advance in front; thus the Spartans, thrown back upon the mountains of Lakonia, in 362, for a time retired from the historical scene. A nation must retrograde if it does not advance; and so the Spartans could not long bear their humiliation. Whilst northern Greece was arrayed against Philip of Makedonia, they took up arms against the Arkadians and Argeians, and pressed them so hard that the latter called Philip to their assistance. The victor of Chaironeia suddenly appeared in the Peloponnesos in the third year of the 110th Olympiad, 338 B. C., and invaded Lakonia with an army too powerful for the Spartans to resist in the field. He laid waste the country, but did not attack the glorious old city herself; nor could he force the stubborn warrior-nation either to ask for peace or to recognize him as the already-proclaimed commander-in-chief of the Panhellenic forces against Persia. Philip, having no rancor against the Spartans, and wishing only to gain the affection of the Peloponnesians, and the support of their troops and treasure for his vast schemes in the east, retired after having awarded the disputed territories* to the Messenians, Megalopolitans, and Argeians. Yet Sparta, like a hunted lioness, remained roaring in her den; she was the only city in all Hellas which stood out against the invincible Makedonian, maintaining her ancient freedom

* It was in the war with Philip of Makedonia, so little known in history, though sufficiently mentioned in Polybios, Pausanias, and other writers, that Sparta lost Kynuria to Argos, other frontier territories to the Arkadians, and the much-contested *Ager Dentheliatos* on Mount Taygetos, with the Temple of Diana Limnatis, to the Messenians. (Tacitus' Annals, iv., 4, 3.)

and dignity under circumstances of feebleness and humiliation with more unshaken resolution than Athens or Thebes.

She, too, under her enthusiastic and youthful king, Agis II., gathered her warriors and a few faithful allies that still yearned to unfurl the banner of independence against Makedonia. But the times had changed; it is with nations as with the human body; they have their period of youthful vigor, manly fortitude and success, and of senile decrepitude. The Spartan battle-line, in 331, was as inferior to the highly organized and irresistible Makedonian phalanx as the latter, one century and a half afterward became, when opposed to the Roman legions of Æmilius Paulus at Pydna, in 168 B. C. Antipater, the lord-lieutenant of Makedonia, during the absence of Alexander the Great in Asia, on the first news of the Spartan movement in the Peloponnesos, hurried to the peninsula at the head of an army of 45,000 troops, and met the Spartans in the straits near Megalopolis, in Arkadia. The Peloponnesians, though inferior in number and arms, fought with heroic valor; Agis, their king, fell fighting sword in hand, and after the loss of five thousand slain, they retired proudly behind the barrier of their mountains. Alexander left them there in peace; nor were they disturbed until King Pyrrhos, the madman of Epeiros, in 272 B. C., from mere chivalrous desire of battle and bloodshed, invaded Lakonia. But he did so in an evil hour. Spartan virgins and matrons dug ditches along the exposed parts of the city, which were defended by the old men; while young warriors in dense columns, with the brave Akrotatos at their head, fell upon the rear of the Makedonians and drove them in disorder across the river. The opportune arrival of the Spartan king, Areus, who had been absent in Crete with the main army, decided the scale of battle. Pyrrhos, with the loss of his son and best troops, retreated, hotly pursued, and with the greatest difficulty, through the passes of Lakonia, and soon after found his death at Argos.

And here begins a new and highly interesting page in

the history of the Peloponnesos, the renewal of the Achaian league by Aratos in 281 B. C. This able and active statesman, after the bold exploit of expelling the Makedonians from Akrokorinth, succeeded in combining Korinth, Troezen, Epidauros, Argos, and even Athens, in the closest alliance with the ten Achaian republics of the Peloponnesos. Arkadia and Messenia joined likewise; proud Lakedaïmon alone resisted, and with that national animosity and irritability which characterize the Hellenes throughout their history, even to the present day, she took up arms against her united republican brethren. The brave and talented Spartan king, Kleomenes III., having restored the old Lykurgian constitution to renewed vitality at home, entered Arkadia at the head of his troops, in 225 B. C. Taking Argos and Megalopolis, he defeated Aratos and the Achaians in several battles, and brought the league into such distress, that the latter called to his assistance the king of Makedonia. Thus the Greeks themselves were now the cause of a new irruption of their former tyrants, which was to prostrate Sparta forever. The great battle of Sellasia, near the river Oinus, north of the city, decided her fate. Her army was again prostrated and cut to pieces by the Makedonian phalanx of King Antigonos Doson, in 222 B. C. She received the victor, and Kleomenes III., the last Herakleid King, perished an exile in Egypt. The Spartans were now obliged to join the Achaian league, and its general, Philopoimen, in order to break the resistance of that stubborn people, abolished every trace of the old Lykurgian institutions. Yet the eagle-eye of Rome had long observed the contest. She now boldly interfered, and taking the part of Lakedaïmon against the Achaian league, brought on that last and decisive war which, 146 B. C., terminated with the conflagration of Korinth, and the subjugation of all Hellas.

The independence of the Grecian republics was now gone forever; Lakedaïmon, however, gained by the change. Rome permitted the Spartans to reëstablish their Lykurgian discipline, such as occasional assemblies of the citi-

zens in the Skias, or hall of assembly, on the market-place, the public dinners in the Syssitia, and the austere education of the youth.

Wealthy Roman tourists soon began to travel to Sparta, that wonderful city, to see the Spartans swallow the black broth, and, no doubt with horror, to witness the cruel flagellations of their boys on the gory altar of Artemis Orthia, in the same manner as at the present day British aristocrats and American democrats go to Rome to see the pope and the carnival. Sparta had already become a name of the past, and a curiosity of the day.

The Romans repaired the city walls; they built the curious little amphitheatre for the horrible, disgusting combats of wild beasts and gladiators, the magnificent aqueduct, splendid baths, altars to the god-like Cæsars, and temples to the Egyptian Serapis: nay, the proud Augustus, after his victory at Actium over Antonius and Cleopatra, came himself to Sparta to thank its inhabitants for the kind hospitality they had rendered to Livia and her sons on their flight from Rome. Augustus, the ruler of the world, sat down to dine with the Spartans, and tasted their black-pork soup and saltish goat-cheese. He rewarded their fidelity by granting them the honor of precedency at the public games of Actium, instituted in commemoration of his naval victory—a bitter insult offered to poor, down-trodden Hellas by the Roman autocrat!

Augustus even extended the territory of Sparta by adding the island of Kythera and certain Messenian cities beyond Mount Taygetos; but later, yielding perhaps to the continual complaints of the subjects of Sparta on the coast of Lakonia, the Roman emperor declared twenty-four cities free of her control. This at once gave the death-blow to the very shadow of her political existence!

The new constitution or confederation of the Lakonian maritime cities, whose inhabitants called themselves *Eleuthero-Lakones*, or Free Lakonians, is mentioned in several interesting inscriptions found at Gytheion, the ancient port of Sparta, at Vitylos, and other places, and gave birth

to the free and war-like people of Mani—the Maniotes, or *Maniots*— who, during the vicissitudes of more than a thousand years, defended their mountain fastnesses against all the attacks of the barbarian invaders of Hellas Vitylos, the Sclavonians, the French Crusaders, and Othoman Turks, and did not break down their castles nor sheath their swords until the arrival of King Otho, by whose exertions this wild country has become one of the most quiet and peaceful provinces of the young kingdom of Greece.

The history of this interesting people, the modern Lakonians, with a description of their rocky and picturesque peninsula, will form the subject of our following articles, which will treat principally of the condition of Sparta and the Peloponnesos during the middle ages, from curious manuscripts lately discovered in the Romaic language, and other historical works.

Lancaster, Pa.

A. L. K.

ART. VI.—THE STATE CHURCH SYSTEM IN EUROPE.

Ueber christliche Toleranz. Ein Vortrag gehalten im Evangelischen Verein zu Berlin am 29. März 1855, von *Friedrich Julius Stahl*. Berlin, 1855.

Die Zeichen der Zeit. Briefe an Freunde über die Gewissensfreiheit und das Recht der christlichen Gemeinde. Von *Christian Carl Josias Bunsen*. Leipzig. 2 Bändchen. 3 Aufl. 1855.

Wider Bunsen. Von *Stahl*. Berl. 3 Aufl. 1856.

Für Bunsen wider Stahl. Die neuesten Bewegungen und Streitigkeiten auf dem Kirchlichen Gebiete. Von *Dr. Dan. Shenkel*. Darmstadt. 1856.

Bunsen und Dörner. Eine Streitschrift wider falsch berühmten Protestantismus. Von *Dr. W. F. Besser*. Schwerin. 1856.

THE works above quoted, which furnish us the occasion for the present article, discuss, from opposite stand-points and in a representative manner, one of the most important questions which now agitates public opinion in Germany, the question of religious toleration and religious freedom.

The glory of America is a free Christianity, independent of the secular government and supported by the voluntary contributions of a free people. This is one of the greatest facts in modern history. Its significance can only be fully estimated by a careful comparison with the State-churches of Europe, over which it makes a gigantic progress. Whatever be the defects and inconveniences of the separation of Church and State, they are less numerous and serious than the troubles and difficulties which continually grow out of their union, to both parties. Our self-sustaining and self-governing Christianity calls to mind the heroic period of the Church, with the important difference, however, that in the first three centuries she had to maintain her existence not only without the support, but in spite of the hatred and bloody persecution of the Roman empire, while in our republic she enjoys the friendship and

outward protection of the civil government, to which she in turn imparts moral strength and stability; so that the two powers are really a benefit and indirect support to each other, without unsettling their distinct boundaries and getting into continual collisions by mutual interference. Body and soul, no doubt, belong together and constitute one man; but the body is not the soul, nor is the soul the body; each has its peculiar members, faculties and functions; it is much more important that the soul should enjoy freedom and independence than the body; and if one must rule over the other, this right belongs naturally to the spiritual and immortal part of man. To the perfect kingdom of God there will be no two powers, but Christ will rule King of nations as he now rules King of saints in his Church. But in the present order of things we must "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's: and unto God the things that are God's," without confounding the one with the other.

Great Britain, although still maintaining two different ecclesiastical establishments, Episcopacy in England and Presbyterianism in Scotland, and thus holding to the theory of the union of Church and State, carries the practice of religious toleration and liberty almost as far as the United States, and the heroic sacrifices of the Free Church of Scotland furnish even a more striking illustration of the vitality and power of the voluntary system, than any of our American denominations.

But on the Continent of Europe such a thing as a free, self-supporting and self-governing Church is hardly known, and exists only in the form of small dissenting sects, which bear no comparison in numerical strength and importance with the dissenting bodies of England and Scotland. In Germany, Austria, Russia, Sweden, Denmark, Italy, Spain, and even in France and in Switzerland, the public religion is interwoven with the State by ten thousand time-honored ties, which it seems impossible to dissolve without endangering the very existence of the Church.

The Roman Catholic Church, it is true, has always as-

serted in principle her supremacy and freedom over against the secular government, which she aims to control and make subservient to her interests, wherever she has the power. By her centralised organization, visible unity, imposing hierarchy and despotic influence over the masses of her membership, she succeeded also in practice to maintain a certain independence, although in constant conflict with Cæsar even in the days of her highest power in the Middle Ages. But, in the first place, Romanism claims only liberty for itself, and denies it, wherever it can, to every other form of religion, on the false assumption that it alone is the true Church, and every dissent from it, a dangerous and damnable error. In the second place, by its hierarchical spirit and overbearing conduct towards the State, of which some of the greatest popes, as Gregory III., spoke in most contemptuous language, as if it was the result of ambition, conquest, rapine and violence simply, and not a divine institution clothed with divine authority, it roused a reaction of the secular power and the spirit of nationality so closely connected with it. Hence, even on its own territory, Romanism is greatly cramped by jealous governments. Gallicanism, which asserts a half way freedom from foreign authority at the expense of domestic liberty, or in other words, substitutes servility to the State for servility to the Pope, still exists legally in France, and is constantly acted upon in Italy, Spain and South America. In Austria the Roman Church was made altogether subservient to the State under the semi-infidel Joseph II., and placed under all sorts of restrictions, which were only recently removed by the famous Concordat of 1855. The future must reveal whether the absolute papacy will improve the morals and promote the prosperity of that empire. Catholicism to this day is nowhere so free from State-control and interference, as in Protestant England (the ecclesiastical titles' bill notwithstanding), and in the United States.

As to Protestantism in Germany, and on the Continent generally, it is almost entirely supported and ruled by the State, and this has a natural tendency to secularize religion

as much as possible and to convert it into a sort of moral police. Fortunately this can never be done fully. For Christianity exerts its indestructible power under all forms of government, and is free and independent in spirit, even where its body, the Church, groans in chains.

The dependent condition of Protestantism dates from the Reformation, which, in Germany, as well as in Switzerland, Denmark, England, and Scotland, proceeded on the hypothesis of the union of Church and State, or even on the Erastian principle of the supremacy of the temporal power, or the territorialistic maxim, *cujus regio ejus religio*. The Protestant princes and magistrates secularized the old Catholic Church-property, and in return assumed the support of the Church out of the public treasury, together with the supreme authority over it. The continental reformers, especially Melancthon, often complained of their avarice and usurpation of episcopal and papal authority. But they were in part themselves to be blamed for it, by confiding the execution of reform to secular hands, and their successors made a theory out of a fact. According to the old Lutheran doctrine, which is still in force practically all over Germany and Scandinavia, the head of the State is at the same time the head or *summus episcopus* of the Church within his territory, and has the right to fill the ecclesiastical offices, to issue new hymn books, liturgies, or even confessions, under certain restrictions, and to superintend not only the external, but to a very considerable extent, also, the internal affairs of religion.

Strange bishops indeed, who never studied theology, nor would ever think of preaching, or of administering the sacraments, and yet claim and exercise supreme authority over the religion of their subjects! Still more strange, if this supreme governor of the Church is a boy, like Edward VI., or a lady, like Queen Elizabeth, or Victoria of England, or a Romanist, like the King of Saxony, the King of Bavaria, and the emperor of Austria, or a notorious adulterer, like the present King of Württemberg, or a professed infidel, like Frederick II., of Prussia!

It is true, there have been not a few wicked popes in Rome, fox-hunting bishops in England, and infidel professors of theology in Germany. But one inconsistency does not justify another. And then we have to do here with a false principle, and not simply with anomalous exceptions. It is equally true, on the other side, that there have been Protestant princes, from the elector Frederic the Wise to King Frederic William IV., who were nursing fathers to the Church, and exercised their spiritual authority in the fear of God and to the promotion of the best interests of religion. But this only shows what we observed above, that the life of Christianity will reveal itself under all outward organizations, and in spite of them, and proves nothing for a form of government which places the highest spiritual authority into secular hands and gives bad princes as much power for the destruction of the Church, as it enables good monarchs to build it up. Bishops and priests have at times made good generals and statesmen, especially in the Middle Ages. But no sensible man would infer from these exceptions, that the clergy should be trusted with the management of the army, the finances, the police, and the foreign affairs. No body will deny that a truly Christian government is a source of infinite blessing to a people. But how few governments, alas! deserve that name? A few years ago the world saw Protestant England and Roman Catholic France fight arm in arm with the Turks against another nominally Christian power. The same government of England, which supports Christianity at home, appropriates from ten to twelve thousand dollars annually to the idolatry of Juggernaut in India, and patronizes an institution for the training of Mohammedan priests in Calcutta. "If they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry." Of such governments, or misgovernments, as Naples, Spain and Mexico, whose shame is all over the world, we will only say with Dante, "Look on and pass."

Of the many evils which are almost unavoidably connected with the State Church system as it exists in Germany,

and all over the continent of Europe, Catholic as well as Protestant, we will mention only a few.

First, it prevents the free and full development of the duty and virtue of Christian liberality and benevolence. While in our country hundreds of churches are built annually, there are hardly more churches in Germany and France now than there were in the Middle Ages. Even in cities, where the population almost doubled itself within the present century, as Paris, Vienna, Berlin and Hamburg, there has been very little or no progress in this direction. The State spends many millions, in some cases, as in Austria and Prussia, one half of its income upon the army, and treats the Church with a step-motherly hand. To build houses of public worship by private contributions, is almost an impossibility. The people are accustomed to look to the government for the supply of all their spiritual wants, and hardly think of devoting a portion of their means to the support of the Gospel at home. It is true, they have to support it nevertheless indirectly by the payment of compulsory taxes. But these are poorly calculated to promote the love and attachment to the Church amongst the large mass of merely nominal members. Pious persons regard it as their duty, of course, to promote the cause of foreign missions and other benevolent enterprises, for which the State makes no provision. But England alone contributes larger sums annually for Missions, for Bible and Tract distribution, than the whole Continent, Catholics and Protestants put together. For liberality in one direction naturally begets liberality in every other. I heard some of the best men in Germany express the deliberate conviction, that if the people had to provide for the maintenance of public worship, as in the United States, they would starve out, or dismiss at least one half of their ministers. This would probably be the immediate effect, and in the many cases of rationalistic and indifferent ministers who would suffer most, their loss would be rather a gain to the Church. But gradually the evil would rectify itself. Necessity is the mother of invention. The people would soon find out the

priceless value and absolute necessity of religion, as they did in France after the excesses of the revolution, and would respect and love the Church more than they ever did before. For man feels a special interest in that which depends in some measure upon his own will and sacrifice, and where his money is, there is his heart also. Many pious Germans, who never dreamed of giving any thing for the support of religion in their native land beyond their pennies on Sundays, and the perquisites for the extra services of the clergyman, after emigrating to America become in a few years quite liberal in proportion to their means, and prosper the more for it. For liberality to Christ's kingdom never yet made a man poor.

Secondly, the State-control of the Church keeps the latter in a state of continual pupilage, and prevents the development of the truly Protestant idea of the general priesthood and kingship of believers. If Luther complained in his day of the incapacity of the congregations to govern themselves and to furnish material for elders and deacons, after the apostolic model, the cause may be found in Romanism, which kept the people in absolute submission to a particular priesthood. But if the same complaint is repeated in our days by high ecclesiastical dignitaries in Prussia, Saxony and Würtemberg, and urged as an argument against the introduction of the Presbyterian form of government, it amounts to a serious charge against Protestantism, which in three hundred years should have been able to train its population to true freedom and self-government. It is true, where the Reformed element prevails, as in Westphalia and on the Rhine, especially in the Wapenthal, there is more or less congregational life and activity as we have it in America. But in the strictly Lutheran sections of Germany the congregations are generally almost as passive as in the Roman Church, and have not even a voice in the election of their own pastors. Hence the German emigrants to this country are generally so inferior to native Americans in all matters of church government and discipline. They will all rule in the consistory,

and no one can rule, because they were never taught it at home, and were only expected to be ruled. Individual and congregational self-government must be gradually acquired like every other science and art. No body ever learned to swim by keeping on the dry land. More recently some progress has been made in Prussia and Würtemberg in the right direction, by the introduction of responsible congregational lay-officers to assist the minister in his duties, but it will take some time until the system is fairly in operation.

Thirdly, the close connection of the secular and spiritual power makes the latter responsible for all the faults of the former, exposes the Church to a great deal of undeserved popular dissatisfaction and hatred, leads to a profanation of the sacraments, makes discipline almost impossible, and tends to beget hypocrisy and infidelity. For religion is a free thing which can never be forced. Compulsion in this delicate matter has generally the opposite effect. State-churchism can impose upon its subjects the external marks of religion, like so many ready-made regimentals on the soldiers, but it cannot correct the hearts, or restrain the conscience, and control the inward conviction, which is free all over the civilized world. It, therefore, fills the Church with a most incoherent and heterogeneous membership, from the highest piety and straitest orthodoxy to the grossest immorality and unblushing infidelity. A great statesman recently said, that the enforcement of a rigid scriptural discipline would result in the expulsion from the Church of three fourths of her membership as decided infidels. This is especially, alas! the case in nominally Catholic France.

It is, unfortunately, only too true, that thousands and millions of nominal Christians in Europe, both Protestant and Catholic, disgrace their baptismal and confirmation vows, and care less for religion than pious heathen, and yet all their children must be baptized on the hypocritical profession of the parents or sponsors. It is only too true, that an amount of hostility exists there to Christianity and the Church, which is unknown in the United States, or even in England. The European infidels, revolutionists and anarchists, if they had the power, would not only dis-

solve the union of Church and State, but destroy the Church altogether, which they hate as the supposed back-bone of all political despotism. It is to be feared that another outbreak, like that of 1848, would repeat the mad acts of the first French revolution which abolished the Christian religion and expelled or guillotined its ministers.

This is the very reason why the great majority of pious and conservative people in Germany cling to the existing order of things. They regard the overthrow of State-churchism as an infidel project, that means really the annihilation of Christianity, and they look only to the immediate results, which, no doubt, would be disastrous enough.

But the whole system of State-churchism is now thoroughly undermined in public opinion, and will, in all probability, gradually give way partly under its own operation, partly in consequence of the direct and indirect influence of the example of England and the United States upon the Continent, and especially upon Germany.

The Parliament of Frankfort, in 1848, proclaimed full liberty of religion and irreligion, and a complete emancipation of the State and the school from the Church and Christianity. This radical measure, to judge from the speeches of some of its chief supporters, as Vogt, the atheist and materialist, proceeded far more from hatred, than from love to the Church, and looked not so much to the freedom of religion, as to the freedom of irreligion. But it remained on paper with the other acts of that assembly, and with the triumph of the reaction, the ecclesiastical establishments became stronger, apparently, than they were before 1848, but only apparently.

The new Constitution of Prussia, adopted in 1850, declares, in clear terms, the freedom of the Churches from the State, and the independence of civil and political rights upon the religious profession, but in a manner altogether respectful to religion, and far more cautious and moderate than the abortive act of the Frankfort Assembly. This amounts in principle to a separation of Church and State, although it is not carried out in practice. The reactionary

party, headed by von Gerlach and Stahl, both men of commanding genius and unblemished moral and religious character, made an attempt recently to erase from article twelve of the *Verfassungsurkunde* the clause which puts all religionists on civil and political equality. The principal object was to exclude the Jews from such equality with the Christians. But a motion to that effect, proposed by Legationsrath Wagner, the editor of the "*Kreuzzeitung*," (and strange to say, himself a dissenter from the State-religion, an Irvingite), was not supported by the government and defeated in the second Chamber (Feb., 1856).

The constitutional guarantee of religious freedom, both public and private, and of ecclesiastical self-government, still stands in Prussia, and the only question seems to be as to the time and best method of its gradual actualization.

We are now prepared to understand and to judge of the merits of the famous Bunsen—Stahl—controversy on religious freedom and toleration, which has excited so much attention recently in Germany, and gives us a clear insight into the present state of parties with reference to this important subject.

It originated with a very able address of Prof. Stahl on Christian Toleration, delivered before a large and highly intelligent audience (the Prussian court was also represented in part) in the Evangelical Association of Berlin, March 29, 1855.

Here the distinguished jurist starts with the assertion, that the religion of the Old and New Testament is essentially exclusive and intolerant over against all false religion. Christianity claims to be the only and universal religion in the world, the only way of salvation, and can, therefore, not be indifferent towards any form of error which deprives God of his honor, and endangers the salvation of man. Under this view Christianity is diametrically opposed to the modern theory of toleration as proclaimed by Voltaire, in France, Frederic II., in Prussia, and Jefferson, in America, which places all creeds and forms of religion, Christian, Jewish, Mohamedan and heathen, on a perfect equality, and

rests, therefore, on complete indifference or downright infidelity. The heathen Pilate, and Lessing's Nathan the Wise, may skeptically ask, "What is truth?" But Christ says, "I am the truth." Here the cardinal virtue of the Christian is not indifference to truth, but unswerving devotion to truth, zeal for the glory of God and the propagation of his kingdom for the salvation of the whole world.

Nevertheless, Stahl continues, Christianity includes a tolerance far deeper than ever entered into the breast of man before. This tolerance rests on that love and charity which beareth all things and hopeth all things; on that humility, which, in the consciousness of its own sin, abstains from judging the neighbor; on that high appreciation of the image of God in man; and finally on the patient resignation to the fact that God has reserved the separation of the wheat from the tares to the last judgment. All this is perfectly compatible with the strictest and most faithful adherence to the divine truth.

But what is now the practical duty of a Christian State to dissenters? Here Stahl draws a sharp line of distinction between the Anglo-American, and what he regards the true German theory. The German evangelical toleration consists in the preservation of the Church, i. e., an established national State-Church, with the recognition of the children of God in all confessions and sects, in their individual capacity. The toleration of the English dissenters and of the Evangelical Alliance places itself essentially on the principle of independency, is a virtual surrender of the idea of the Church in its organic capacity, and places all evangelical confessions and sects on a perfectly civil and religious equality, so that the distinction between Church and sect disappears altogether. And yet this theory which proclaims toleration to all Protestant sects, is intolerant against Romanism, and maintains towards it generally the uncompromising hostility of old Puritanism, as if it was no part of Christianity at all. Stahl admits that this English theory is making considerable progress in Germany, and urges on to a general Protestant war against the Romish Church.

But the true mission of German Protestantism is a higher one, the unity of the Church, not a confederation of sects. Whether this Church shall be Lutheran, or Reformed, or United Evangelical, is a difficult question to be solved by the German Protestantism itself, but the result in any case will be a united Church, and not an indefinite number of coördinate sects. The sound tendency is to unity and harmony, not to division and distraction. The German Protestantism can never recognize the evangelical sects as such, but only individual members of them as brethren in Christ, not because, but in spite of their sectarian connection. It may concede to them the free exercise of their religion, but not the liberty of propagandism to the injury of the Church. The concession in every particular case must be decided by the State, and this has no reason to be especially liberal towards domestic disturbers and foreign propagandists.

Nor can the Protestantism of Germany, according to Stahl, engage in a passionate war against Romanism, but must maintain its historical position, which includes a bond of union with, as well as protest against, the Catholic Church before and after the Reformation. It looks to a final union of the Lutheran, Reformed, and Roman Catholic Churches, (what becomes of the Greek communion?) and this is the highest and the most comprehensive form of true toleration and catholicity, not in the Romish sense of uniformity, but in the sense of fulness and totality. It means the ultimate comprehension of the three great confessions, into which Christendom is now divided, into one indissoluble economy of the kingdom of God, to which this separate mission prepares the way. The Roman Church has the particular mission to represent the visible unity and historical continuity of Christianity up to the apostolic age. The Reformed Church is distinguished for its deep fear of God, its energetic faith, its missionary zeal, and tries to build up a world of Christian institutions on the basis of the holy congregation of the believers. The Lutheran Church has the mission to unfold the deepest mysteries of faith and to

show the harmony and interpenetration of the divine and human, the spiritual and natural in the person of Christ and in his sacrament. These peculiar charismata must all be preserved and taken up into the final constitution of the Church. The expectation of such a Church, concludes Stahl, which is elevated above all earthly confessions, and yet their completion in harmony, makes us truly tolerant, not in the indifference, but in the faithfulness to the divine truth and to the particular Church in which we were born, and to which we are sworn.

These are the views of Stahl. There is undoubtedly much truth in them, if we look to the final end of the Church, which is certainly not a mere friendship and brotherhood of sects, but one flock under one shepherd, an organic unity of all believers, one holy catholic kingdom of Christ, that shall include every thing that is true and good and beautiful in the various branches and periods of Church history. But this very end can be best attained by the freest development of Christianity and all its energies, and not by any mechanical square-and-rule-system which only retards its true progress. Stahl confounds the Jewish standpoint with the spirit of the New Testament, in which not one single passage can be found in favor of any compulsion in matters of mere conscience and religion, and he does great injustice to several branches of Protestantism which have as good a mission to fulfil as Romanism and Lutheranism. Yet we would not justify, on that account, the sarcastic severity with which Cheyalier Dr. Bunsen, formerly Prussian Ambassador at London, now residing near Heidelberg, has attacked these views in his "Signs of the Times," 1855. He regards Stahl's tract on Christian toleration as a conceited plea for confessional intolerance, which would justify in principle the most bloody persecutions of the Romish Church. He takes up the pen for religious liberty against all intolerance, whether it proceeds from Romanism or Protestantism. His views may be reduced to the following points:

- 1.) The absolutism of the State has strengthened the absolutism of the hierarchy.

2.) Protestantism has never developed itself vigorously and taken root in the people, except where it produced civil liberty as the necessary fruit of ecclesiastical reform. This development is found only in the bosom of the Reformed Churches, and not in the Lutheran.

3.) Civil liberty has succeeded only on the basis of self-government, and this is impossible without liberty of conscience. Freedom rests on the congregation, and this again on personal religious self-determination.

4.) The hierarchy claims freedom of conscience only for itself, and instinctively opposes it in others.

5.) Religious freedom has never yet led to political revolution, but its suppression has.

6.) Intolerance and persecution have never blessed either government or people; but they are the greatest curse to a Protestant government, because they involve an inner contradiction.

With all this, Bunsen still holds to the union of Church and State, and especially to the Prussian establishment, and simply pleads for the fullest toleration of all religious dissenters, provided only they do not violate the laws of the State, or of public morality. His position, therefore, is substantially English, and not American, although he speaks with high regard of the United States, particularly of the influence of Puritanism on civil and religious liberty. But we regret that our esteemed friend has mixed up, with his noble and spirited defence of religious freedom, a good deal of theological liberalism and latitudinarianism, which would be rejected as unsound and dangerous, both in England and in this country. He makes too little account of confessions and creeds, and spreads the mantle of union so far, that Luther, Lessing, Göthe and Hegel may dwell under it in peace, and commune at the same table of the Lord.

Hence the orthodox party denounced Bunsen, forgetful of his former services to evangelical religion, in the strongest terms. Hengstenberg, in his *Vorwort* to 1856, treats his book as perfectly worthless, filled only with idle wind,

calls the author an apostate, charges him with radicalism, and pantheism, applies to him the passage of the unclean spirit, who returns with seven others worse than himself, and compares his Christian phrases with the kiss of the traitor! This is strong enough in all conscience. Leo handled him with equal severity. Stahl wrote a lengthy reply, *Wider Bunsen*, which his admirers and sympathizers regard as a complete extinguisher, and it must be admitted, that as a logical reasoner and skilful dialectician, he is superior to the more brilliant Bunsen, exposes many weak points very successfully and fortifies his own position in regard to toleration and the union apparently with more consistency, on the basis of State-churchism.

But the general principle of religious liberty found a most hearty response throughout Germany, and the celebrated ex-diplomatist has suddenly become one of the most popular men, and that, too, in circles where he was formerly disliked for his religious views. Public opinion pointed him out already as the future minister of public worship in Prussia. The "*Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*" of Berlin boldly declared (1856. N. 7): "The liberty of conscience is a power of the present age, an idea which takes hold with divine irresistibility of all hearts and of all nations, from which no man and no state can escape for any length of time." But not only the liberal and radical organs of the press, but even decidedly evangelical divines, as Dr. Dörner, and Dr. Schenkel, have openly come out for Bunsen and against Stahl and Hengstenberg.

Still others, who have mixed in the controversy, take middle ground between the two extremes. So Dr. Krummacher, who wishes the established Church and the union kept up on decidedly orthodox, though less exclusive ground than Stahl, but asks, at the same time, full toleration for such sects as the Baptists, whom the latter despises as mere disturbers, and favors the Evangelical Alliance.

This seems to be also the position of the King of Prussia, who was formerly an intimate friend of Bunsen. He feels painfully the responsible weight of the ecclesiastical

supremacy of the crown, and declared once openly, he wished the time would soon come, when he could place it back into the proper hands and let the Church manage her own affairs independent upon, and yet in friendly harmony with the State. Although he heard Stahl's famous speech, and allows his small but powerful party a large share in the present management of the Church and the State, he expressed himself nevertheless on several occasions decidedly opposed to all persecution for religious opinion's sake, and has even extended a cordial invitation to the Evangelical Alliance, whose professed object is the promotion of religious liberty throughout the world, to meet at Berlin in 1857. This, too, is a sign of the times.

Mercersburg, Dec., 1856.

P. S.

"ODD-FELLOWSHIP EXAMINED IN THE LIGHT OF SCRIPTURE AND REASON, BY REV. JOSEPH T. COOPER, D. D.", re-examined according to the Word of God, and official Documents of the Order, by a member of Harmony Lodge, No. 16, I. O. O. F. Higgins & Perkenpine, Philadelphia. 1856. 172 pp.

AN earnest, well-written book, which seems, to use a familiar proverb, to aim at killing two birds with one stone. Ostensibly a defense, as the title imports, of the Order of Odd-Fellowship against the charges alleged by Rev. Dr. Cooper in a series of published Lectures, which in fact it also really is, in great measure at least, the book, nevertheless, crosses its arms, Isaac-like, and lays its right hand on Christ and His Church, vindicating their infinitely superior claims whenever, in the author's judgment, they come in conflict with any prevailing practices of Odd-Fellowship. Those portions of the Documents which enjoin faith in God and the duty of religious worship, though in a defective manner, he interprets from his own point of Christian observation, rather than in the light of the Documents themselves, objectively considered. This feature, however, must give peculiar interest to the work, especially in the eyes of truly Christian men who belong to the Order.

The merits of the question at issue between Rev. Dr. Cooper and the author, are comprehended in the more general question relating to the consistency of any secret Order, as organized and prevailing at the present day, with the nature, claims and resources of the Church of Jesus Christ. Into the discussion

of this more general question we do not propose to enter in this short notice. The principle and spirit of the Mercersburg Review sufficiently indicate our position. The Church of Christ is a divine Order on earth, whose organization, functions and powers are adequate to the deepest wants and all the woes of man in all his relations and under all circumstances, and, if true to herself, must supersede the necessity of any independent human Associations originated and perpetuated for similar purposes.

THE PROTESTANT THEOLOGICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL ENCYCLOPEDIA: being a condensed translation of Herzog's Real Encyclopedia, with additions from other sources, by Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D. D., assisted by distinguished theologians of various denominations. Part III. Philadelphia. Lindsay & Blakiston. 1856.

THE Editor of this valuable theological publication, which is steadily advancing, has recently received a letter from Dr. Herzog, the Editor of the original work, which fully endorses the principles upon which the condensed translation is conducted. As this letter will be interesting to many of our readers, we give place to it in preference to any remarks of our own.

REV. AND DEAR SIR:

First of all, I owe you an apology for my long delay in answering your cordial and flattering letter. New obstacles constantly came in my way, besides my absence from home on a vacation tour.

You must allow me to render you my thanks for the kind and indulgent reception with which you and your friends have honored my Encyclopedia. I feel myself greatly encouraged by such kind appreciations of my labors, and incited to press onward with my difficult task, and use every exertion to prove myself not wholly unworthy of such confidence. Such encouragements are truly a balm to the spirit under the manifold heavy toils, perplexities, vexations, and cares of all sorts, which the editing of a work like this involves. What chiefly supports me under all this, is the thought that I have undertaken a work which may somewhat subserve the interests of Protestant Theology, and the Protestant Church. That eminent men in America so regard my work, and that it has found so many friends in that country, who sympathize with its true catholic spirit, is for me an important consideration. May God enable me in carrying forward the work, to develop those characteristics more and more, which have won for it so much confidence. In reference to your condensed translation, I must confess that it has my full approval, as have also the principles you have adopted, as communicated to me in your welcome letter, and which I find carried out in the first part of your translation sent to me, and I must express my gratification

that the work has been undertaken by such competent hands. If such a translation should be attempted—and it was very natural that the matter should be thought of—it would necessarily assume the form which you are giving to it; that is, on the one hand it must be an abridgement, and on the other include additions of many articles which I have omitted. In regard to the former point, you remark with perfect correctness, that many articles may be condensed without injury to their integrity. In this respect you are much more at liberty than I can be.

In regard to the second point, you could hardly avoid introducing some articles which I have omitted, especially from Winer's Real Lexicon. Moreover, you will find occasion to take up some English names which I have not noticed; neither should I be surprised at your omission of some names which I have taken up, but which are of less importance for your readers. In this respect again I must fully approve of your plan, as one that necessarily calls for the exercise of personal discretion.

I conclude with the prayer that the blessing of God may rest upon your undertaking, that it may accomplish much good, and prove a new bond of union between the Protestant Churches of America and Europe. I repeat my thanks for your grateful letter, &c., &c.

Respectfully yours,

HERZOG.

To the Rev. J. H. A. BOMBERGER,
Editor, &c., &c.

FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE AND THE NEW ENDOWMENT SCHEME, by Rev. E. V. Gerhart, President. Chambersburg. M. Kieffer & Co.

Franklin and Marshall College is engaged in a two-fold enterprise: the increase of the Endowment Fund by the sale of Temporary Scholarships, and the increase of the Building Fund by soliciting donations from the citizens of the City and County of Lancaster. This little volume of 96 pp. 12mo., has been prepared with the view of spreading correct information on the general subject, in order to awaken a deeper interest in the movements of the Institution. It contains first a brief sketch of the history of Franklin College and of Marshall College, and of Franklin and Marshall College, in which Institution these two, previously existing separately, are now united. This is followed by a statement of the position, the wants, and prospects, and an explanation of the plans of the College. It concludes with an earnest effort to enforce the claims of the Endowment Scheme to general cordial support, on the ground of the relation which higher education sustains to the State, to the Church, and to the best interests of all classes of the people.